

Concordia Theological Monthly

Vol. IX

MAY, 1938

No. 5

A Course in Lutheran Theology

(Continued)

The subject of our first study in *De Servo Arbitrio* was the *sola Scriptura*. The second deals with the *sola gratia*. *De Servo Arbitrio* is a powerful exposition of the fundamental truth that we owe our salvation exclusively to the grace of God, in no wise and in no degree to our own power and activity. "The true scope of *De Servo Arbitrio* is to prove that man is saved not by any ability or efforts of his own but solely by grace. . . . Everything is pressed into service to disprove and explode the assertion of Erasmus that the human will is able and 'does work something in matters pertaining to salvation' and to establish the monergism, or sole activity, of grace in man's conversion." (*Concordia Triglotta*, Hist. Intr., p. 211.)¹⁴ Luther plainly indicates that as his

14) Cp. Th. Harnack, *Luthers Theologie*, p. 180 ff.: "Eben dies bildet, wie Ausgangspunkt und Ziel seiner Schrift, so die durchgaengige Basis derselben — er bekaempft ruecksichtslos die schriftwidrige und oberflaechliche Ansicht seines grossen Gegners, weil sie Gottes freie Gnade und Christi Verdienst schmaelert." W. Walther, *Lehrbuch der Symbolik*, p. 305: "In seiner Schrift *De Servo Arbitrio* hatte Luther des Erasmus Behauptung, der Mensch habe noch den freien Willen, sich einigermassen dem Guten zuzuwenden, bekaempft und seine Glaubenserfahrung, dass unser Heil allein von Gott und seiner Erwaehlung abhaenge, verfochten." Do not misread the book! "The *De Servo Arbitrio* was not written to establish a philosophical opinion or defend a theological speculation but to prove that God's grace was the sole power that effected our salvation, because he was firmly convinced that he could only be sure of the fact of his own redemption" (salvation) "if God alone was its source, continuance, and consummation." (J. C. Mattes, in *Luth. Church Quarterly*, Oct., 1937, p. 414.) "Wenn also die Schrift *De Servo Arbitrio* die Absicht verfolgt haette, die Allwirksamkeit Gottes zu erweisen — wie noch heute manche 'Lutherforscher' lehren, so koennte sie ebensogut ungeschrieben bleiben. Wenigstens pflegt sich Luther sonst nicht bei Dingen aufzuhalten, die auch der ratio feststehen. . . . An der Begrueudung des Glaubens, naemlich an der Gewissheit des Heils, ist Luther aber auch in dieser Schrift viel, wenn nicht alles, gelegen. . . . Ueber allem, was von Rechtfertigung, Versoehnung und Erloesung gesagt wurde, steht: *Sola gratia*." (W. Elert, *Morphologie des Luthertums*, I, p. 106 f.)

chief theme: "Our salvation is apart from our own strength and counsel and depends on the working of God alone (which I hope I shall clearly prove hereafter in the course of this discussion)." (P. 72;¹⁵) cp. p. 35.) The sinner's conversion depends on the working of God alone. We do not effect it nor contribute anything towards it.¹⁶

This, then, is the issue between Luther and Erasmus, between the Lutherans and the synergists, "whether our own will does anything in those things which pertain unto eternal salvation or is only passive under the work of grace?" (p. 30). Erasmus answers: "I consider free will in this light, that it is a power in the human will by which a man may apply himself to those things which lead unto eternal salvation or turn away from the same." (P. 122. — *Diatribes*, XVIII, 1612. 1755.)¹⁷ "Judas had it in his power to change his own will." (P. 247.) "The human will is a something placed in a free medium; there is an endeavor which can exert itself either way." (P. 309.) Erasmus insists that "there are two causes of man's conversion, grace being the chief (*principalis*) cause and our will the lesser (*minus principalis*) cause.... Both must be said: that God's grace works in us and that our will and endeavor cooperate with God" (*Diatribes*, XVIII, 1649). Luther affirms, "*dass der freie Wille nichts sei*"; that man of his own will, mind, power, contributes nothing towards his conversion; that "it is not in the power of the human will to choose" (p. 74); "that, when God is not present with us to work in us, everything that we do is evil and that we of necessity do those things which are of no avail unto salvation" (p. 72); "that the will cannot will anything but evil" (p. 247); that man, before he is regenerated into the new creation of the kingdom of the Spirit, does nothing and endeavors nothing towards his new creation into that kingdom;... but the Spirit alone effects both in us, regenerating us and preserving us" (p. 318); and all this by grace: "Grace is therefore needed and the assistance of grace is therefore given because 'free will' can of itself do nothing" (p. 320).¹⁸ What saith Scripture?

15) *The Bondage of the Will*, Cole-Atherton translation.

16) The entire work of salvation, conversion, and justification is God's work. We shall let Luther deal with the Semi-Pelagian-synergistic denial of the *sola gratia* in justification later on and confine ourselves for the present to the *sola gratia* in conversion.

17) The references in this form are to the St. Louis edition of Luther's works.

18) *De Servo Arbitrio*, denying the *liberum arbitrium*, does not deny that man can exercise somewhat a free choice in mundane matters. It "allows man a 'free will' not in respect of those things which are above him but in respect only of those things which are below him.... We know that man was constituted lord over those things which are beneath himself, over which he has a right and a free will, that they

The body of *De Servo Arbitrio* is made up of three parts, each of which deals with a series of Scripture-passages. The first part examines the passages adduced by Erasmus in the *Diatribæ*. The second vindicates, against the strictures of the *Diatribæ*, the proof from Scripture heretofore brought by Luther. In the third part, seeing "that the enemy is already dispatched by the one weapon or the other, I shall be as brief as the subject will allow; and from such numerous armies I shall produce only two champion generals with a few of their legions—Paul and John the Evangelist" (p. 324). Take time to study each one of these fifty and more Bible-verses and study them in the order in which Luther presents them. For the present we shall discuss only a portion of them. And we shall group what Luther says in connection with them under four heads.

First, Scripture tells those who imagine that "there is a power in the human will by which a man can apply himself to those things which lead unto eternal salvation "that their mind and will is utterly corrupt, altogether impotent in the spiritual sphere, capable only of evil and viciously active in it. Let those who find powers for good inhering in man study Gen. 6:3, 5: "Man also is

should obey him and do as he wills and thinks" (pp. 79. 378. — XVIII, 1957). It does not deny that it lies in the power of natural man to perform some outward works of the Law. It "grants that 'free will' can by its endeavor move itself in some direction unto good works or unto the righteousness of the civil or moral law" (p. 348. Cp. Apology, Art. 18). It does not deny that the will of the Christian, renewed in conversion, chooses and performs the good. "We are not now considering what we can do in cooperation with God. . . . God does not work in us without us, seeing that He has for this purpose created and preserved us" (spiritually), "that He might operate in us and that we might cooperate with Him: thus, by us He preaches, shows mercy to the poor, and comforts the afflicted." (P. 317 f.) Nor, finally, does the term *servum arbitrium*, "bondage of the will," at all imply that the will of man acts by compulsion, against its own will. "Will, whether divine or human, does what it does, be it good or evil, not by any compulsion, but by mere willingness or desire, as it were, totally free." (P. 41.) "If the will were forced, it would be no longer will." (P. 74.) The natural man indeed cannot will anything but evil, but his "will is led on and carried away by its own willing; no violence is done to its will, because it is not forced against its will" (p. 235). Just ask him! So also "the sons of God do good with a free will" (p. 190), not under compulsion, against their will. Just ask them! Natural man "is a captive, slave, and servant to the will of Satan" (p. 79); at the same time "he does not evil against his will as by violence, but he does it spontaneously and with a desirous willingness" (p. 72). So also the Christians "are led captives by the Spirit of God, at His will, so that we cannot will anything but that which He wills" (p. 74). At the same time their will is free: "When God works in us, the will, being changed and sweetly breathed on by the Spirit of God, desires and acts, not from compulsion but responsively, from pure willingness, inclination and accord. . . . This is the royal liberty." (P. 73.) — In this discussion the question: Has man a free will? means: Has the sinner a part in effecting his conversion, his salvation?

flesh. . . . Every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually," and he must conclude with Luther: "Since men are 'flesh,' they can savor of nothing but flesh; so far is it from possibility that 'free will' should do anything but sin." . . . And "He does not say that man is intent or prone to evil but that evil altogether, and nothing but evil, is thought or imagined by man throughout his whole life." (Pp. 277. 279.) How much 'free will,' how much good, does Rom. 3:9 leave man? "He who describes them all as being 'under sin' leaves them no degree of good whatever." (P. 332.) And how can they strive after the good, get ready to submit to the Spirit of God, who *know nothing* of these things? "God *reveals* the righteousness of faith to them (Rom. 1:17) as being ignorant and sitting in darkness; therefore of themselves they know it not. . . . Nor can they extricate themselves therefrom nor endeavor to extricate themselves; for how can you endeavor if you know neither what you are to endeavor nor in what way nor to what extent you are to endeavor?" (P. 328.) "How should 'free will' discover Him [Christ] when it is itself dark and devoid even of the light of the Law, which might discover to it its disease, which disease in its own light it seeth not, but believeth it to be sound health, Rom. 3:20?" (P. 345.) On Rom. 3:19 f: "Such ever has been, and still is, the hardness and insensible obstinacy of our hearts, that we never should of ourselves hear or feel the force of these thunder-claps or thunder-bolts but should, even while they were sounding in our ears, exalt and establish 'free will' with all its powers, in defiance of them." (P. 338.) Moreover, "here [Rom. 8:5 ff] let the advocate for 'free will' answer me: How can that endeavor toward good 'which is death' and 'which is *enmity against God*'?" (p. 364). Finally, this enmity is ever stimulated and absolutely controlled by Satan. "Satan is the prince of the world and rules in the wills and minds of those men who are his captives and servants. Shall that roaring lion, that implacable and ever restless enemy of the grace of God and the salvation of man, suffer it to be that man, his slave and a part of his kingdom, should attempt good by any motion in any degree, whereby he might escape from his tyranny, and that he should not rather spur and urge him on to will and do the contrary to grace with all his powers?" (P. 308.) Erasmus and the synergists actually teach that men, who are under the absolute domination of Satan, are able to engage in good and noble endeavors. Satan laughs at such madness.

This impotency and viciousness applies to the whole of man. Rom. 3:10-23 is clear and emphatic on this point. "What is it to be 'gone out of the way' and to 'have become unprofitable' but for men to have no power in one single faculty, and the least power

in their most noble faculties, to turn unto good, but only to turn unto evil?" (P. 335.) Again, if man is not corrupt in every faculty, "John ought not to say (John 3:18) of the *whole man* that he is condemned already but to speak thus: Man according to his 'grosser affections' is condemned already; but according to that which is best and 'most excellent' he is not condemned, because that endeavors after faith." And Luther adds: "Hence, where the Scripture so often saith 'All men are liars,' we must upon the authority of 'free will' say, The Scripture rather lies." (P. 377.) — Erasmus offers to bargain with Luther. He will be satisfied if Luther will let "free will" play any part, the least part, in the matter of salvation. "Erasmus would recommend to me that we should grant *some certain little* to 'free will.'" (P. 321. — *Diatribes*, XVIII, 1660.) Luther will grant nothing, "not any particle or power of 'free will'" (p. 372), "nicht ein Teilchen oder irgendeine Kraft des freien Willens" (XVIII, 1952), "nicht irgendein Fuenklein oder Meitlein vom freien Willen" (J. Jonas's translation, Walch, XVIII, 2460). — "The natural man is not able to do anything towards his conversion, either wholly or half or in any, even the least or most inconsiderable, part." (Form. of Conc., *Trigl.*, p. 885.)

This utter lack of 'free will' is found in all natural men. Scripture puts all classes of men into one class. Every single one of them is spiritually impotent. "They are all under sin," Rom. 3:9, and "he who says 'all' excepts none. . . . 'There is none that doeth good,' not even one of them." (P. 332 f.) "If there were any in the world who by the powers of 'free will' endeavored so as to attain unto good, John (in John 1:10) certainly ought in reverence for these persons to have softened down the term, lest by a word of such general application" (world) "he should involve them in all those evils of which he condemns the world." (P. 368.) Luther calls Rom. 1:18 to the attention of Erasmus and asks: "Were there no men out of these two most exalted nations (Jews and Greeks) who 'aspired to what was meritoriously good'? Were there none among men who thus aspired with all the powers of their 'free will'? Yet Paul makes no distinction on this account; he includes them all under wrath and declares them all to be ungodly and unrighteous." (P. 327.) "This also is no powerless thunderbolt where the apostle says: 'All have sinned and are without the glory of God; for there is no difference,' Rom. 3:23. What, I pray you, could be spoken more clearly? Produce one of your 'free will' workmen and say to me, Does this man sin in this his endeavor? If he does not sin, why does Paul not except him? . . . If therefore you except any man, for any kind of devoted desire or work, you make Paul a liar." And Luther is willing to put this to the

test of experience. "Put the question to all the exercisers of 'free will' to a man, and see if you can show me one who can *honestly* and from his heart say of any one of his devoted efforts and endeavors, This pleases God." (P. 350 f.) And still the synergists up to this day are dividing mankind into two classes, one of which is made of better stuff than the other and is able to overcome the resistance of the flesh to grace, able in some way or other to employ their natural powers to make the right use of the grace offered them, able to "apply themselves to those things which lead unto eternal salvation."

But some of the modern synergists here plead, There comes, in some unaccountable way, a season and day when the Holy Spirit finds the natural mind of man somewhat more accessible to grace; or, There are regions in the soul of man, where man finds some ability to exercise self-determination, efforts and endeavors towards the good. No, no, says Luther. He declares: "He that saith 'all' (Rom. 3:23) excepts no one in any place, at any time, in any work or endeavor" (p. 350), and on the authority of John 3:31: "If there were any power in man which at any time, in any place, or by any work did not savor of the earth, the Baptist ought to have excepted this person and not to have said in a general way concerning all those who are out of Christ that they are of the earth and speak of the earth" (p. 379).

A final point made by Luther in this connection should be stressed. Erasmus teaches that "free will" is a power in the human will by which a man may apply himself to those things which lead unto eternal salvation or turn away from the same." That puts man into a neutral condition. "You who make it out that the human will is a something placed in a *free medium* and left to itself, certainly make it out at the same time that there is an endeavor which can exert itself either way." (P. 309.) But, says Luther, the human will is not left to itself. The will of the unconverted "is the captive of Satan." Satan does not permit his captives to remain neutral. At no time is the flesh, the natural mind and will, neutral. It is at all times, in every condition, on the side of Satan. It never engages in neutrality talk. It is always loyal "to the prince of the world" (p. 308). Apply this to the modern form of synergism, according to which natural man is indeed originally at warfare with God, but somehow or other some are put into a neutral state, occupy a *status medius*, by virtue of which these neutrals "can apply themselves to those things which lead unto eternal salvation or turn away from the same." No, says Luther. No, says Scripture. Before conversion all men are entirely flesh, opposed to God with every fiber of

their being, capable only of resisting grace, at no time, in no condition, neutral.¹⁹⁾

So what is left of "free will"? Nothing but the name. In 1518 Luther had declared: "*Liberum arbitrium post peccatum res est de SOLO TITULO, et dum facit, quod in se est, peccat mortaliter.*" (13th Heidelberg Proposition. XVIII, 38.) The *Diatribes* is much exercised over this statement. (XVIII, 1630.) The fathers of Trent went into a paroxysm over it: "If any one saith that, since Adam's sin, the free will of man is lost and extinguished or that it is a thing with only a name, yea a name without reality, a figment, in fine, introduced into the church by Satan, let him be anathema." (Sess. VI, Can. XX.) And the synergists denounce it as extravagant language. But Luther will not change his language. The passages quoted constrain him to say again and again: "'Free will' is a mere empty term, whose reality is lost." (Pp. 139, 92, 94.) "These words [Rom. 3:20] bring that miserable thing 'free will' to nothing — nothing at all." (P. 347.) "Why do we so tenaciously hold an empty word, to the peril and mockery of the believing people? . . . This abuse of language does not befit theologians but only stage-players and public informers." (P. 78 f. — *Histriones et quadruplatores*; XVIII, 1722: "*Komoedianten und Betrueger*"; Schumacher's translation: "*Erzschelme und Gaukler.*")

How can theologians who accept the passages quoted as God's truth become or remain synergists? It is a mystery — a mystery of iniquity. "I must confess I am more than astonished that, when Paul so often uses those universally applying words 'all,' 'none,' 'There is none that doeth good; no, not one,' . . . I am more than astonished, I say, how it is that words and sentences, contrary and contradictory to these universally applying words and sentences, have gained so much ground, which say: There is something in man which is good and which endeavors after good." (P. 361 f.)

In the second place, it is grace alone that saves, converts the sinner. "Our salvation is apart from our own strength and counsel and depends on the working of God alone, which I hope I shall clearly prove hereafter in the course of this discussion." (P. 72.) Luther clearly proves (1) that the sinner *needs* God's grace. Towards the conclusion of his treatise he states: "For grace is there-

19) Discussing the matter psychologically. Luther says it would be "a certain logical subtlety" to say that "in the will of man there is a certain *willing*, which cannot indeed will good without grace, but which nevertheless, being without grace, does not immediately will nothing but evil, but is a sort of *mere abstracted willing*, veritable, upwards unto good by grace and downwards unto evil by sin." That is a psychological impossibility. "That desire and endeavor cannot be a mere *willing*; for desire must strive and attempt something (as good perhaps) and cannot go forth into nothing nor be absolutely inactive." (P. 137.)

fore needed, and the assistance of grace is therefore given, because 'free will' can of itself do nothing." (P. 320.) He had just quoted John 3:27: "A man can receive nothing except it were given him from heaven." And before that, having quoted Rom. 3:9: "They are all under sin," he had pointed out that "Paul's whole design is to make grace necessary to all men" (p. 336).

Scripture clearly teaches (2) that the sinner needs God's *grace*. Here, Rom. 9:30 f., "is a most clear testimony of Paul, proving that grace is given freely to the most undeserving and unworthy and is not attained unto by any devoted efforts, endeavors, or works, either small or great, of any men, be they the best and most meritorious" (p. 367). "God crowns the undeserving." (P. 268.) What does Rom. 9:13 teach? "It stands manifest that God called Jacob before he was born, because He loved him, but that He was not first loved by Jacob nor moved to love him from any merit in him." (P. 256.) What does Is. 40:2 teach: "She hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins"? Erasmus says: "It does not follow from this passage that man cannot by works morally good prepare himself for the favor of God." (P. 284.) Luther says: "My Isaiah stands victor over 'free will' and clearly shows that grace is given not to the endeavors of 'free will' but to sins and demerits." (P. 284.) And that applies not only in the matter of justification but also in the matter of conversion. Some present-day synergists hold that there are strivings and stirrings in some men which do not indeed merit the grace of conversion but prepare the way for it. Luther asks these men to study Rom. 10:24: "I was found of them that sought me not." That is to say: "It was given them to hear and know Christ, when before they could not even think of Him, much less seek Him or prepare themselves for Him by the power of 'free will.' From this example it is sufficiently evident that grace comes so free that *no thought concerning it or attempt or desire after it precedes.*" (P. 366.)

And (3) Scripture teaches that grace *does everything* in conversion. It teaches it in all those passages which declare that the sinner can do nothing towards converting himself or towards preparing himself for conversion. And it teaches it in all those passages which make the Holy Ghost the sole Author of conversion. "Man, before he is regenerated into the new creation of the kingdom of the Spirit, does nothing and endeavors nothing towards his new creation into that kingdom; . . . but the Spirit alone effects both in us, regenerating us, and preserving us when regenerated, without ourselves, as James saith: 'of His own will begot He us with the Word of Truth,' Jas. 1:18." (P. 318.) Turn again to John 15:5 and learn that "'free will' is a captive of Satan, which cannot be liberated unless the devil first be cast out

by the finger of God" (p. 309). Ask Jacob and every other child of God to what they attribute their deliverance from their former evil state. "Jacob attained unto that unto which Esau attained not solely by the grace 'of Him that calleth,' Rom. 9:11." (P. 253.) But you must read all the passages brought forward by Luther in this connection. When you find your synergistic flesh clamoring for a hearing, you must study "*De Servo Arbitrio*, where Luther presents from every point of view and magnifies in every way the power of the grace of God, the work of the Holy Ghost, who 'changes' the evil, wicked will of man, 'turns' and 'renews' it" (*Lehre u. Wehre*, 28, p. 388). May it be "given us to understand both truths: that we can do nothing of ourselves and next, if we do anything, God works that in us" (p. 186).²⁰⁾

"As many places as there are in the Holy Scriptures" ("and what is more than half of the Holy Scriptures but mere promises of grace, by which mercy, life, peace, and salvation are extended from God unto men," p. 168) which make mention of assistance, so many are there which abolish 'free will.' . . . Grace is therefore needed because 'free will' can of itself do nothing." (P. 320.) "Das nennt Luther seine 'gute, starke, feste, gewisse Folge, wenn ich sage: Die Schrift preiset allein Gottes Gnade, darum ist der 'freie Wille' nichts'; darum verleugnen die Schuetzer des freien Willens Christum." (Th. Harnack, *op. cit.*, p. 181. See St. L., XVIII, 1911. 1952.) — And the voice of the Pelagian and synergist is still heard in the Christian land!

In the third place, a further conclusive refutation of Erasmus's arguments for "free will" is provided by these very arguments themselves. Erasmus, too, quotes a lot of Scripture and most of the Scripture which he quotes consists of imperative and conditional statements. And this is his chief argument: Since God commands men to do good, to turn unto Him, it must lie in the power of man to effect his conversion, at least in part. He quotes Is. 21:12: "Return, come," and asks triumphantly: "Of what use is the appeal that they should turn and come to Him if they are absolutely not their own masters?" (*Diatribes*, XVIII, 1621.) He quotes Eccles. 15:15-18 ("If thou wilt keep My commandments, . . ."); Is. 1:19 ("If ye be willing and obedient, . . .");

20) How grace effects the sinner's conversion is set forth in these words: "Those who, feeling their sins, are distressed and exercised with desperation are raised up by the word of promise." (P. 169 f.) "The riches of the kingdom of God are offered to the world by the Gospel. . . . The Gospel is nothing else than the word by which are offered unto us the Spirit, grace, and the remission of sins obtained for us by Christ Crucified, and all entirely free." (Pp. 187.199.) Hearing "the Gospel voice, the sweetest consolation to miserable sinners: 'I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; . . . turn ye' (Ezek. 33:11)," the sinner, "his will being changed and sweetly breathed on by the Spirit of God," turns to Jesus and rejoices in the grace of God (pp. 73.167).

Is. 52:1 ("Awake, awake"); Mal. 3:7 ("Return unto Me"); "Make you a new heart"; "Believe in Christ," and concludes: "If what is commanded be not in the power of every one, all the numberless exhortations in the Scriptures, and also all the promises, threatenings, exhortations, reproofs, asseverations, benedictions and maledictions, together with all the forms of precepts, must of necessity stand coldly useless." (Pp. 174. 206.) Erasmus is sure of his case. He has found many such passages, "a countless number." He tried to count them and found "that there are more than 600 such passages in Holy Scripture" (XVIII, 1640). But "if we can do nothing, to what purpose are so many laws, so many precepts, so many threatenings, and so many promises?" (p. 345).

When Erasmus "concludes: Man can do those things; otherwise the precepts are given in vain, this reply must be made: Madam Diatribe, you make a bad inference. . . . Does it follow also from 'Love the Lord, thy God, with all thy heart' — therefore thou art able to love with all thine heart?" (pp. 156. 162). Luther denies that the command presupposes and proves the ability to do it. And logic is on the side of Luther. *A praecepto ad posse non valet consequentia*. The same applies to conditional statements. Luther puts it this way: "If Caesar shall conquer the Turks, he shall gain the kingdom of Syria; therefore Caesar can conquer, and does conquer, the Turks." (P. 189.) Erasmus can prove his case with those 600 texts only by "teaching us, by a new kind of grammar, that *ought to be* is the same as *having been*" (p. 167): that "what is spoken imperatively and what is spoken indicatively, is the same thing" (p. 207). And "the Diatribe is so drowned, suffocated in, and corrupted with that sense of the carnal interpretation 'that impossibilities are commanded in vain' that it has no power over itself, but as soon as it hears an imperative or conditional word, it immediately tacks to it its indicative conclusions: A certain thing is commanded; therefore we are able to do it, or the command is ridiculous" (p. 272. — XVIII, 1872).²¹⁾

Furthermore, Erasmus's argument would prove too much, and whoever does that has lost his case. Erasmus combats the opinion of the Pelagian claim that conversion in its entirety is the work of man. But if the logic and grammar of Erasmus is correct, the command to believe proves not that man can assist in his conver-

21) Walther, *Law and Gospel*, p. 262: "The mere issuing of such demands" ("Do this, and thou shalt live"; "Awake") "does not prove that man can comply with them. An old and true maxim runs thus: *A debito ad posse non valet consequentia* (No valid conclusion can be drawn from an obligation to the ability to do it). When a creditor demands payment that does not prove that the debtor can pay." Lenski on 2 Cor. 5:20: "The synergistic reasoning is fallacious that, since God tells men to be reconciled, men must have the ability to obey."

sion but that he can effect the whole of it. "If the conclusion of the *Diatribes* stand good, the Pelagians have evidently established their point. . . . In what degree soever, therefore, you speak against the Pelagians, who from this passage" (and any one of the 600) "ascribe the whole to 'free will,' in the same degree, and with much more determination, shall we speak against that certain small remnant desire of your 'free will.' . . . If that conclusion of yours be admitted, it will make for the Pelagians against all the others; and, consequently, it makes against the *Diatribes*; which in this passage is stabbed by its own sword." (P. 149 f.) Let us glance at one more passage as interpreted by Erasmian logic and grammar, the first passage he quotes from the New Testament, Matt. 23:37-39. "It marches forth in front, as it were the Achilles of these flies." Erasmus argues that, if there are no powers of free will in the men of Jerusalem, the reproach "Ye would not" would be out of place. "Might not Jerusalem here have justly said in reply to the Lord, Why dost Thou weary Thyself with useless tears?" Luther replies: "That passage of Matthew either forcibly proves 'free will' altogether or makes with equal force against the *Diatribes* itself and strikes it prostrate with its own weapon." (P. 179 f.)

Finally, as to the argument of Erasmus that, if there were no spiritual power in man, these imperatives would be "ridiculous" and "out of place," Luther shows that these commands, invitations, and exhortations serve a good, necessary, and saving purpose. We have here, first, legal admonitions—"Keep the commandments." These are addressed to men "that it may plainly appear to them how unable they are to do it. . . . Human reason thinks that a man is mocked by a command impossible; whereas I say that the man by this means is admonished and roused to see his own impotency" (pp. 145. 153). We have, next, the evangelical invitations and exhortations. Imperatives are employed "that by them not only the impotency of 'free will' is shown, by which no one of those things can be done; but it is also signified that a time will come when all those things shall be done, but by a power not our own, that is, by the divine power" (p. 185). Erasmus knows nothing of the nature and power of these evangelical invitations. "Our friend *Diatribes* makes no distinction whatever between the voice of the Law and the voice of the Gospel." (P. 162.) The Gospel commands make no demand on us whatever, but offer the gifts of salvation, console and lift up the despairing sinner and thereby create the faith called for. "The word 'turn' in the evangelical sense is the voice of the divine consolation and promise by which nothing is demanded of us but in which the grace of God is offered unto us. . . . And that of

Christ (Matt. 11:28) 'Come unto Me, all ye that labor,' etc., is the Gospel voice and the sweetest consolation to miserable sinners. . . . By this, as the word of offered grace, the bruised and afflicted are called unto consolation. . . . He is raising up and comforting the sinner lying under this affliction and desperation." (P. 162 ff.) And receiving this comfort means to believe. Offering the comfort is creating faith. When God bids a man to believe on the Lord Jesus, He is not making sport of the impotent sinner, but now "the time has come when all those things shall be done, but by a power not our own, that is by the divine power" inherent in the Gospel call.²²⁾ Finally we have the admonitions addressed to the converted, "by which they are animated, comforted, and raised up to go forward, to persevere, and to conquer" (p. 192), by which "Paul exhorts *Christians* to the fruits of faith" (p. 201). — No; these admonitions and commands — of whatever class — are not futile words. But they would be futile, of no use whatever, and altogether ridiculous if men were expected to follow them by their own natural power.

This argument of Erasmus, that the imperative and conditional statements in the Bible prove the ability of man, the power of 'free will,' — illogical and antisciptural as it is, — exercises a strong fascination on men. Theologians of all times and of every description, Catholic and Protestant, have come under its sway.²³⁾ Irenaeus operated with it. "If it were not in our power to do or not to do these things, what reason had the apostles and much more the Lord Himself to give us counsel to do some things and to abstain from others?" (*Against Heresies*, IV, chap. 37, 4.) It is an axiom in Catholic theology: "God commands not impossibilities." (*Canons and Decrees of Trent*, Sess. VI, chap. XI.) It is, says Kromayer, the "*argumentum primum et palmarium Pontificiorum*" that, if man could not cooperate towards his conversion, there would be no sense in God's calling upon him to repent. (See Hoenecke, *Ev.-Luth. Dogmatik*, III, p. 286.) And the synergists within the Lutheran Church unhesitatingly adopt

22) "Walther points out that the words 'Repent ye and be converted' or 'Believe on the Lord Jesus,' addressed to men who are dead in sins, are like the words of Christ spoken to dead Lazarus: 'Lazarus, come forth,' that is, that *through these words* conversion, faith, life, is produced. 'Deswegen kann ein Mensch auf diese Worte sich bekehren, weil ihn Gott mit diesen Worten bekehrt.'" (*Lehre u. Wehre*, 36, p. 315 f.) Cp. Pieper, *Christliche Dogmatik*, II, 565 f., on *admonitiones legales* and *admonitiones evangelicae*.

23) The philosophers are no better. Kant himself is a victim. "Die bisherigen Ausfuehrungen Luthers zeigen, dass er fuer Kants (des 'Philosophen des Protestantismus') 'Du kannst, denn du sollst' sicher kein Verstaendnis gehabt haette." (Zickendraht, *Der Streit zwischen Erasmus und Luther*, p. 90.)

the wicked theology and faulty logic of Erasmus. Laternmann declares in the spirit and with the assurance of Erasmus: "*Si conversio hominis a parte Dei tantum pendet, omnes adhortationes ad conversionem fore frustranes.*" (Baier, III, p. 223.) In our days, to mention a few typical examples, Luthardt has said: "Die Schrift bezeichnet die Bekehrung theils als ein Werk der Gnade, theils als eine Leistung des Menschen. . . . Busse und Glaube wird vom Menschen gefordert als seine Leistung: μετανοία καὶ μετάνοια — auf allen Stufen der Heilsgeschichte. Der Forderung der Busse soll und kann der Berufene alsbald nachkommen." (Luthardt-Jelke, *Komp. d. Dog.*, p. 384.) It does not enter the mind of Luthardt that some people might not see the force of the argument that, since God calls upon man to believe, man must be able to achieve his conversion, at least in part. Dr. W. Laible follows the same line of thought. He quotes Eph. 4:23: "Be renewed in the spirit of your mind," and says: "Mit diesem Gebot sagt Gott zum ersten, dass der Mensch sich erneuern kann. Er wuerde es nicht sagen, wenn es nicht moeglich waere." (*Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenz.*, Sept. 30, 1932.) To quote one American representative of this school of loose thinking, Dr. L. Keyser taught in *Election and Conversion*, (1914), p. 44: "Christ began to preach to unregenerate men by saying, 'Repent ye and believe the Gospel.' Why command them to do what they were utterly unable to do? . . . Why bid a man believe when he couldn't?" It is a deplorable situation. Dr. Stoeckhardt describes it thus: "The truth that faith and conversion is demanded and required does not permit the deduction 'that the performance lies in the will of man, which puts the offered power to the right use.' In the Lutheran Church this belongs to the rudimenta doctrinae. Modern theology, however, has completely lost sight of it." (*Lehre u. Wehre*, 32, p. 219. See also 43, 130 ff.) The course in Lutheran theology given in *De Servo Arbitrio* is much needed today. Luther tells these modern Lutherans: "Heap together out of the large concordances all the imperative words into one chaos, . . . and I will immediately declare that by them is always shown what men ought to do, not what they can do. . . . Thus it comes to pass that you theologians are so senseless and so many degrees below even schoolboys that, when you have caught hold of one imperative verb, you infer an indicative sense, as though what was commanded were immediately, and even necessarily, done or possible to be done." (P. 155. — XVIII, 1781.)

Nor do the other arguments and "Scripture-proofs" of Erasmus help the case of "free will." The desperation which inspired them proves that the case is hopeless. For instance, how does he treat John 15:5: "Without Me ye can do nothing"? "This passage,"

says the *Diatribē* (XVIII, 1646), "Luther considers his Achillean sword and invincible weapon." Luther: "I will just look on and see by what force the full-mouthed and heroic *Diatribē* will conquer my Achilles." (P. 305.) And how does Erasmus try to render the force of this blow harmless? It is a simple matter: "Without Me ye can do nothing," that is, *perfectly*." (P. 306.) Luther of course answers that "nothing" means "nothing": "I stand by the natural and grammatical signification of the term, laughing both at your armies and at your triumphs." And he makes the additional point that, if "nothing" only means "nothing perfect," it does mean something good, albeit imperfect, and then "we may preach that the ungodly, who are without Christ, can, while Satan reigns in them and wars against Christ, produce some of the fruits of life, that is, that the enemies of Christ may do something for the glory of Christ" (p. 306).

Another sample: "The passage Rom. 9:11f: 'Jacob have I loved. . . . Not of works, but of Him that calleth,' the *Diatribē* evades by saying 'that it does not properly pertain to the *salvation* of man.'" (P. 251. *Diatribē*, XVIII, 1636.) Luther answers, first, that, whether these words pertain to salvation or not, the question is here whether *merit* comes into consideration, and "Paul proves that Jacob attained unto that unto which Esau attained not solely by the grace of 'Him that calleth.'" Secondly, "it is not only the external rule of servitude which is there spoken of but all that pertains to the Spirit of God; that is, the blessing, the Word, the Spirit, the promise, of Christ, and the everlasting kingdom. And this the Scripture more fully confirms afterwards, where it describes Jacob as being blessed and receiving the promises and the Kingdom. But it is wearisome to contend with these depraved attempts to pervert and evade the Scripture." (P. 254.)

Erasmus even tries this: "Nothing" in John 15:5 cannot mean absolutely "nothing," because that would mean "that 'free will' cannot even sin without Christ, whereas Luther, nevertheless, says 'that 'free will' can do nothing but sin'" (p. 314. — *Diatribē*, XVIII, 1646). No comment.

One more Erasmian argument: "It is not to be believed that God would overlook an error in His Church for so many ages" (p. 96), meaning that the doctrine *de libero arbitrio* cannot be an error, since it has been taught by so many Fathers for so long a time. Luther answers, among other things, that "these men of renowned talent' have been thus blind to the praise and glory of 'free will,' in order that that highly boasted of 'power by which a man is able to apply himself unto those things that pertain unto eternal salvation' might be eminently displayed, that very exalted power which neither sees those things which it sees nor hears

those things which it hears, and much less understands and seeks after them" (p. 114).²⁴)

That is the best Erasmus can do for synergism. It leaves synergism in bad shape. But do not blame Erasmus too much. The case of "free will" is so bad that no advocate can save it.

In the fourth place, Luther, drawing the hideous picture of "free will," adds a few more strokes, which bring out in still stronger relief the utter incapacity of the natural will of man for good and its unlimited capacity for evil. It is found, according to Rom. 3:9, not only in the worst of men but also, in the same degree, *in the best of men*. Among those who are "under sin" "those must also be numbered who are the best and most laudable, who aspire after that which is meritorious and good with all the powers of 'free will'" (p. 334). Again, "'free will' is then the worst when it is the best; and *the more it endeavors, the worse it becomes*, and the worse it is. The words [Rom. 1:21] are plain; the division is certain; nothing can be said against it" (p. 332). Worse still, the closer God draws to the sinner, the more virulent and malignant the enmity of "free will" grows. Luther had pointed out that men "cannot *endeavor* to extricate themselves; for how can you endeavor if you know not what you are to endeavor after?" (p. 328). But what results when God endeavors to show them what is needful? What results when God reveals the *Law* unto them? "Being blinded and hardened by the flesh, they only become the worse the more they are judged." (P. 277.) And what results when the Gospel is preached to them? "It is confirmed even by this very scripture [Rom. 9:17 f.] . . . that an evil will could will nothing but evil and that, as the good which it hated was presented to it, it could not but wax worse and worse." (P. 229.) "Look at the Jews, instructed by so many wonders and so many successive prophets. What did they think of this way of righteousness? They not only did not receive it, but so hated it that no nation under heaven has more atrociously persecuted Christ unto this day (1 Cor. 1:23; Rom. 1:18)." (P. 329.) "Is this [Rom. 9:30 f.] not plainly saying that the endeavor of 'free will' is all in vain, even when it strives to do the best, and that 'free will' of itself can only fall back and grow worse and worse?" (P. 366.)²⁵)

24) Pieper: "Despite the fact that synergism is the product of rationalism the synergistic arguments against the *sola gratia* are nothing but paralogsms, glaring offenses against logic, as we found when we reviewed the various objections to monergism. . . . What effect will a course in synergistic theology have on the youthful students? Since these objections operate with paralogsms, such a course is a systematic training in illogicalness." (*Christl. Dogm.*, II, 594.597.) *Per contra*, if you need a course in logic, study *De Servo Arbitrio*.

25) Cp. *Proceedings*, Noerdl. Dist., 1868, p. 13.

And, finally, if the flesh in the Christian cannot endeavor after good but strives only after evil, how dare the synergist say that there may be spiritual stirrings in the unconverted? "I omit to bring forward that truly Achillean scripture of mine, which the *Diatribē* proudly passes by untouched,—I mean that which Paul teaches Rom. 7 and Gal. 5, that there is in the saints and in the godly so powerful a warfare between the spirit and the flesh that they cannot do what they would. From this warfare I argue thus: If the nature of man be so evil even in those who are born again of the Spirit that it does not only not endeavor after good but is even averse to, and militates against, good, how should it endeavor after good in those who are not born again of the Spirit and who are still in the 'old man' and serve under Satan?" (P. 383. — XVIII, 1961.)

Pelagianism and synergism stand condemned at the bar of Scripture. "If our subject of discussion is to be decided by the judgment of Scripture, the victory in every respect is mine; for there is not one jot or tittle of the Scripture remaining which does not condemn the doctrine of 'free will' altogether." (P. 382.) There is not a single passage in Scripture behind which synergism may hide. And there are thousands of passages which forbid Erasmus to open his mouth in the Christian Church. In fact, all Scripture does that. It is not a Lutheran hyperbole to say: "The whole Scripture, in every letter and iota, stands on my side." (P. 324.) All Scripture is either Law or Gospel. And the Law, charging man with utter corruption, proclaims that "free will" can do nothing, and the Gospel publishes the sweet message that grace does everything.

How is it possible that in the face of this clear teaching of Scripture the Pelagian-synergistic heresy has found so many advocates among the theologians? Luther is amazed at this state of affairs. "I must confess I am more than astonished that, when Paul so often uses those universally applying words 'all,' 'there is none that doeth good; no, not one'. . . , so that, if any one wished to speak otherwise so as to be more intelligible, he could not speak in words more clear and more plain—I am more than astonished, I say, how it is that words and sentences contrary and contradictory to these universally applying words and sentences have gained so much ground, which say there is something in man which is good and which endeavors after good, as though that man, whoever he be, who endeavors after good, were not comprehended in this one word 'all' or 'none' or 'not.'" (P. 361. — XVIII, 1944.) And as Luther goes on to study the baneful nature and effect of this heresy, his amazement, his sorrow, and his hot indignation grow apace.

(To be continued)

Kleine Danielstudien

2. Daniels Buch

In der vorigen Nummer dieser Zeitschrift sind die Personen und die Geschichte Daniels näher ins Auge gefaßt worden. Wenn wir nun an das Buch selbst herantreten, so ist zunächst zu sagen, daß kaum ein anderes Buch der Bibel von jeher so viel Interesse erregt hat, aber auch von Schwärmern aller Art so oft falsch ausgelegt worden ist, wie die Offenbarung St. Johannis. Und das ist kein Wunder, denn es ist ein Buch voll großer Geheimnisse, merkwürdiger Bilder, mächtiger Ausblicke. Aber die Offenbarung lehnt sich stark an an die alttestamentlichen Bücher Hesekiels, Daniels und Sacharjas, und besonders ist das Buch Daniel gewissermaßen die Grundlage für das Buch der Offenbarung. Um die Offenbarung zu verstehen, muß man immer wieder auf Daniel zurückgehen; aber auch das Umgekehrte ist wahr. Gar manches in Daniel wird klar durch das, was in der Offenbarung steht. Daniel ist eben ein apokalyptischer Prophet, und sein Buch gehört zu der sogenannten Apokalyptik. Was besagt dieser vielgebrauchte Ausdruck? Er will sagen: Daniels Weissagungen sind nicht einfache oder erhabene prophetische Reden mit drohendem und verheißendem Inhalt, wie zum Beispiel die des Jesaja. Jesaja kommt zu seinem Volk und ruft ihm zu: „So spricht der Herr!“ Er donnert, Kap. 1, 2–15, oder er redet zum Herzen, Kap. 40, 1–11. Daniels Neben sildbern auch nicht symbolische Handlungen, die besondere Tatsachen der Geschichte oder der Schicksale des Volkes Israel abbilden sollen, wie die vielen symbolischen Handlungen bei Hesekiel; vgl. das über diesen Propheten im vorigen Jahrgang, Februarheft, S. 89, Ausgeführte. Vielmehr enthält Daniels Buch, zumal im zweiten Teil, merkwürdige Visionen von Bildern über die zukünftige Gestaltung und die Geschichte der Weltreiche, deren Kampf gegen das Reich Gottes und den endlichen Sieg des Reiches Gottes über alle Feinde, besonders den größten Feind, den Antichristen, durch die herrliche Wiederkunft Christi. Zu diesem apokalyptischen Charakter des Buches gehört auch die ganz eigenartige, konkrete, oft groteske Schilderung. Wir hören von Tieren, die etwas bedeuten: Löwe, Bär, Leopard und ein unnenbares schweißliches, schreckliches Tier, Kap. 7, von einem Widder und einem Ziegenbock, Kap. 8, von zehn Hörnern und einem kleinen Horn, Kap. 7, von Zahlen, die sich menschlich nicht berechnen lassen und doch eine Bedeutung haben: von siebenzig Siebenheiten oder Wochen, die dann in sieben, zweiundsechzig und eine Woche zerlegt werden, Kap. 9, 24–27, von einer Zeit, zwei Zeiten und einer halben Zeit, Kap. 7, 25; 12, 7, eine Zeitbestimmung, die dann in anderer Weise in der Offenbarung wiederkehrt. Dieser apokalyptische Charakter des Buches hängt mit Daniels besonderer Stellung und eigenartigem Beruf zusammen und entspricht den Verhältnissen des Exils. Das damalige Gottesreich war im Weltreich verschlungen, und Gott mußte zeigen und

wollte zeigen, daß er der Allmächtige und Allwissende ist, vor dem nichts bestehen und verborgen sein kann und der alles zum Heil seiner Kirche gestaltet und siegreich hinausführt. Wir werden darum auch erkennen, daß Daniel, gerade wie dann im Neuen Testament die Offenbarung, einen Flug anstellt durch die ganze Welt- und Kirchengeschichte von seiner Zeit an bis zum Ende aller Zeit. Aber bei solchen Apokalypsen müssen wir auch im Auge behalten, daß ihre Darstellung nicht wie bei andern prophetischen und besonders historischen Büchern so verläuft wie die Punkte einer Linie; sie geht nicht von einem Zeitpunkt zu einem andern Zeitpunkt, von Monat zu Monat und von Jahr zu Jahr, sondern die Darstellung geht vorwärts und geht dann wieder zurück, geht wieder weiter und geht wieder zurück.

Wenn wir uns nun den Inhalt des Buches Daniel vergegenwärtigen, so wollen wir nicht ausführlich, sondern nur nebenbei eingehen auf die mancherlei Schwierigkeiten, die uns gerade beim Studium dieses Buches entgegentreten, besonders sprachliche, historische und chronologische Schwierigkeiten, die in neuerer Zeit viel verhandelt worden sind und die die moderne Bibelkritik seit der Zeit des Rationalismus gegen die Wahrheit, Echtheit und Glaubwürdigkeit des Buches immer ins Feld führt und darum dessen Entstehung in viel späterer Zeit, in der Massabäerzeit um die Mitte des zweiten Jahrhunderts vor Christo, ansetzt. Dies wäre eine besondere Aufgabe, die uns auf isagogisch-kritischem Gebiet festhalten würde und die von gläubigen Verteidigern des göttlichen Wortes wie Hengstenberg, Robert Die Wilson und andern trefflich behandelt worden ist. Darum übergehen wir auch jetzt die merkwürdige und vielverhandelte Erscheinung in diesem Buche, daß es in zwei Sprachen geschrieben ist, Kap. 1, 1—2, 3, und dann Kap. 8—12 in hebräischer Sprache und Kap. 2, 4—7, 28 in aramäischer Sprache, und bemerken nur kurz folgendes: Wenn sich auch kein alle Fragen lösender Grund für diese Erscheinung angeben läßt, so läßt sich doch zur Erklärung dies sagen, daß beide Sprachen damals nebeneinander hingingen und von den Hörern und Lesern des Buches verstanden wurden; das Hebräische hatten die Juden auch im Exil nicht verlernt, und das Aramäische hatten sie schon vorher zum Teil gelernt und gebrauchten es namentlich im Exil, weil es die Volks- und Hofsprache war, die *lingua franca* der alten Zeit. Der Anfang des Aramäischen findet sich Kap. 2, 4b, wo die Sternseher und Zeichendeuter dem König Nebukadnezar, als sie ihm seinen Traum deuten sollten, auf Chaldäisch, Syriac, oder, wie es im Grundtext heißt, auf aramäisch, אַרָמֵא, antworteten. Und der Schreiber des Buches fährt dann im Aramäischen fort, auch nachdem diese Episode zu Ende ist, weil eben ihm und seinen Lesern beide Sprachen geläufig waren, gerade wie heutzutage auch in unserer Kirche so häufig auf Versammlungen und in Briefen und Schriften Deutsch und Englisch nebeneinander hergehen und gebraucht werden. Daß diese Eigentümlichkeit des Buches nicht etwa ihren Grund hat in verschiedenen

Dokumenten, zeigt die durch das ganze Buch sich hindurchziehende Einheit des Schriftwerkes; und Böhmer und andere haben wohl recht, wenn sie als Erklärungsgrund des Sprachentwessels dies nennen, daß die Votenschaft an die Welt, Kap. 2-7, in der Weltsprache ergehe, und was Israel spezifisch angeht, in der heiligen Sprache dieses Volkes gesagt werde.¹⁷⁾ Auch über diesen Punkt finden sich bei den bibelgläubigen Verteidigern des Buches Daniel treffliche Ausführungen, ganz besonders bei dem amerikanischen Gelehrten Robert Dick Wilson,¹⁸⁾ dessen Untersuchungen gerade auf diesem Gebiete auch von denen anerkannt werden, die sonst auf einem ganz andern Standpunkt stehen. Der deutsche Gelehrte Baumgärtner nennt Wilsons Ausführungen darüber eine „ohne Frage gründliche und umfangreiche Studie“,¹⁹⁾ und drei bekannte Professoren der Chicago-Universität, die Theologen Gerald Birney Smith und Shirley Jackson Case und der Assyriolog D. D. Luddenbill, sagten in einer Besprechung der eben erwähnten Princeton Studies von Wilsons Aufsatz: „The Aramaic of Daniel' is the title of his [Professor Wilson's] very valuable article on Aramaic philology. There can be no doubt that he has disposed of many, if not most, of Professor Driver's linguistic arguments for the late date of Daniel.“²⁰⁾

Wir wollen uns aber jetzt hauptsächlich mit dem Inhalt des Buches beschäftigen und mit den sachlichen Schwierigkeiten, wie sie sich in manchen Kapiteln finden. Das Buch Daniel ist eben ganz besonders ein Kampffeld. Wir erinnern wieder an Busefs Wort: „The Book of Daniel is especially fitted to be a battle-field between faith and unbelief. It is either divine or an imposture.“ Vgl. auch Hengstenbergs Ausführung, Aprilheft, S. 270. Aber selbst liberale Bibelkritiker der Neuzeit wie Cornill, einer der getreuesten Schüler Wellhausen's, des Gelehrten, der mehr als irgendein anderer die moderne, liberale Bibelkritik in die Wege geleitet hat, sagt: „Der Erfolg des Buches ist ein ungeheurer gewesen, bestimmend für die ganze spätere Literatur und auch im Neuen Testament sehr deutlich zu spüren.“²¹⁾

Die Disposition und Einteilung des Buches ist ganz klar, und die beiden Teile, in die es zerfällt, findet jeder Bibelleser von selbst. Kap. 1-6 enthält die Geschichte Daniels, und Kap. 7-12 bringt die Gesichte Daniels. Der geschichtliche Teil spielt sich, wie wir schon erkannt haben, ab während der Zeit der babylonischen Gefangenschaft des Volkes Gottes,

17) Böhmer, Reich Gottes und Menschensohn im Buche Daniel, S. 150-157; Theologisches Literaturblatt, 20 (1899), 567.

18) The Aramaic of Daniel in *Biblical and Theological Studies*, by the Members of the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary, 261-306.

19) Das Aramäische im Buche Daniel. Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 4 (1927), 84.

20) *American Journal of Theology*, 17 (1913), 101.

21) Einleitung in das Alte Testament, S. 262.

606—536 vor Christo. Der zweite Teil hingegen, der die wunderbaren Visionen enthält, weisagt die welt- und kirchengeschichtlichen Ereignisse nach dieser Zeit, redet von der persischen Zeit, verkündigt das Aufkommen der dritten, griechisch-mazedonischen Weltmonarchie, die Diabochenzeit und dabei insonderheit das Auftreten und Wüten des syrischen Königs Antiochus IV. oder Epiphanes, des Edlen oder Herrlichen, the Illustrious, im zweiten Jahrhundert vor Christo, dem greulichen Vorbild des neutestamentlichen Antichristen, schildert dann im Anschluß an dieses Vorbild das Gegenbild, den rechten, wahren, Antichristen, der aus der vierten, römischen Weltmonarchie hervorkommt, und geht damit bis an das Ende der Zeit; denn nach Daniel und besonders nach den klaren Weissagungen des Neuen Testaments wird der Antichrist bleiben, bis der Herr ihm ein Ende machen wird durch die Erscheinung seiner Zukunft, 2 Thess. 2, 8. Die Weltgeschichte führt zum Weltgericht. Auf den Trümmern der gewaltigen und gewalttätigen Weltreiche erhebt sich das ewige Friedensreich des Menschensohns, schon hier in der Zeit und wird vollendet dort in der Ewigkeit. Und wenn dies alles im Laufe der Zeit geschehen ist, dann lobfingen die Überwinder am gläsernen Meer beim Saitenspiel ihrem Gott zu Ehren und sagen: „Groß und wunderbar sind deine Werke, Herr, allmächtiger Gott; gerecht und wahrhaftig sind deine Wege, du König der Heiligen. Wer soll dich nicht fürchten, Herr, und deinen Namen preisen? Denn du bist allein heilig. Denn alle Heiden werden kommen und anbeten vor dir; denn deine Urteile sind offenbar worden“, Offenb. 15, 3, 4.

Wir gehen nun durch das Buch nach seinen einzelnen Kapiteln, greifen aber besondere Abschnitte zu eingehenderer, besonderer Behandlung heraus. Wir benutzen dabei die einschlägigen Werke von Keil, Alfesoth, Lange-Zöckler, Busey, R. D. Wilson, Montgomer, besonders auch die populäre Darstellung von Stockmann, und andere mehr.

Die geschichtliche Einleitung. Kap. 1

Nach den Anfangsversen zählte man das dritte Jahr des jüdischen Königs Jojakim, das Jahr 606 vor Christo. In Babel herrschte damals noch der alte König Nabopolassar; ihm folgte in dieser Zeit sein junger, kräftiger, schon vorher zur Anteilnahme, namentlich als Befehlshaber des Heeres, herangezogener Sohn Nebukadnezar. Die uralte, reiche Weltstadt Ninive war 612 zerstört worden, das assyrische Reich war zugrunde gegangen. Nun machte sich Nebukadnezar auf gegen Ägypten, und bei Karchemisch oder Circessium am Euphrat kam es zur Entscheidungsschlacht zwischen ihm und Pharao Necho, dem König Ägyptens, von dem 2 Kön. 23, 29—35; 2 Chron. 35, 20—36, 4; Jer. 46, 2 Weiteres berichtet wird. Nebukadnezar siegte und zog dann nach Jerusalem, das damals Ägypten tributpflichtig war, und unterwarf es sich. Alle diese alten Großkönige waren Imperialisten im vollen Sinne des Wortes, trachteten nach der Weltherrschaft. Die Angabe Dan. 1, 1 „im dritten Jahr des

Reichs Jojakims" und Jer. 46, 2 „im vierten Jahr Jojakims" ist kein Widerspruch. Die Expedition Nebukadnezars wird längere Zeit, wohl ein bis zwei Jahre, gedauert haben, und der eine Schreiber mag ihren Anfang, der andere ihr Ende nennen. Das hebräische Wort für „kam", Dan. 1, 1, נָסַב, heißt nicht bloß an einen Ort hinkommen, sondern auch nach einem Orte gehen, ziehen. Wir Amerikaner reden vom Kriege von 1812, obwohl er mehrere Jahre dauerte. Nebukadnezar nimmt dabei vornehme junge Judäer gefangen und läßt sie nach Babel bringen, unter ihnen Daniel mit seinen drei Freunden. Und dann wird erzählt, wie diese vier frommen jüdischen Jünglinge gewissenhaft der väterlichen Religion treu bleiben und nicht Speisen essen wollen, deren Genuß ihnen durch das jüdische Gesetz untersagt war. Dies war der Fall nicht nur, weil ihnen Fleisch von unreinen Tieren oder Fleisch, dem sonst die leviitische Reinheit fehlte, dargereicht werden konnte, sondern besonders auch, weil nach heidnischem Gebrauch ein Teil der Speisen und Getränke als Opfer für die Götter dargebracht wurde und so für die Israeliten eine Beteiligung am Götzendienst bedeutete. Diese Gewissenhaftigkeit und Glaubensstreue zeigten sie auch bei dem Unterricht, der ihnen durch die babylonischen Gelehrten zuteil wurde. Das Heidentum, das ihnen jetzt in dem glänzenden Gewand der hochberühmten Weisheit und Kultur des Morgenlandes vor die Augen trat, machte keinen tieferen Eindruck auf sie, sondern befestigte sie nur in ihren frommen Grundsätzen. Und Gott segnete und belohnte aus Gnaden ihre Treue so sehr, daß sie bei der Prüfung am Schluß des Unterrichts durch ihre Leistungen ihre Mitschüler übertrafen und sogleich als Mitglieder der Magierkaste im königlichen Hofdienst angestellt wurden. Über Daniels Wirken in dieser Kaste wissen wir nichts Näheres. Aber gewiß hat er seinen Kollegen auch den wahren Gott und die messianische Hoffnung seines Volkes verkündigt. Darauf führt die Geschichte von den Weisen aus dem Morgenlande, die aus diesem Teil des Orients kamen und von dem zu erwartenden König der Juden wußten, Matth. 2.

Das Bild von den großen Weltmonarchien. Kap. 2

Es war im zweiten Regierungsjahr Nebukadnezars. Er hatte die Höhe seiner Macht erstiegen, lag in einer Nacht wachend im Bette und beschäftigte sich mit der Frage, „wie es doch hernach gehen würde", B. 29. Dieser Satz, der B. 45 wiederholt wird, darf nicht übersehen werden, denn er ist ein Schlüssel zum Verständnis des ganzen Kapitels. Solche Ausdrücke und Aussagen gehören auch zu dem apokalyptischen Charakter einer Schrift. Vgl. Offenb. 1, 1: „was in der Kürze geschehen soll"; 1, 3: „Die Zeit ist nahe"; 22, 6: „was bald geschehen muß" und das wiederholte „Siehe, ich komme bald", 3, 11; 22, 7. Die Kirche ist in der Welt, wird von der Welt und ihren Reichen beseindet, bekämpft, schier verschlungen. Aber sie kann nicht untergehen. Auch die Pforten der Hölle sollen sie nicht überwältigen. Der Herr errettet sie, und wenn

es zum Äußersten kommt, erscheint er zum Gericht. Der Weltherrscher Nebukadnezar hatte das Weltreich Ägypten durch seinen Sieg bei Karchemisch aus Asien zurückgedrängt. Er hatte das andere Weltreich, das assyrische, mit seiner Hauptstadt Ninive zusammenstürzen sehen. Was wird nun einst das Schicksal seines auf den Trümmern Assyriens erbauten babylonischen Weltreichs sein? Er hat ein wunderbares Traumgesicht in dieser Nacht, sieht im Traum eine unheimliche, große Gestalt, deren glänzende Erscheinung mit einem schrecklichen, plötzlichen Sturz endet. Der König erwacht, von Entsetzen erschüttert; aber beim Erwachen bleibt ihm nur noch eine dunkle Vorstellung von etwas unerhört Grauenhaftem, das er im Traum gesehen hatte. Den Traum selbst hat er vergessen. Wenn man bedenkt, wie sehr die Heiden zu jener Zeit von der Macht des Aberglaubens beherrscht wurden und welch große Bedeutung sie auffallenden Träumen beizumessen pflegten, kann man es wohl verstehen, wie tief dieser Traum den König beunruhigte. Darum tat er alles, um den Traum und dessen Bedeutung zu erfahren, läßt alle Traumbedeut, Sternseher, Beschwörer und Wahrsager zu sich kommen, aber ohne Erfolg. Aber dann tritt Daniel auf den Schauplatz, und gestärkt durch die Gebetsgemeinschaft mit seinen Glaubensgenossen, wird ihm in einem Nachtgesicht von Gott der Traum des Königs samt der Deutung geoffenbart, B. 19; und nun schildert er, vor den König vorgetragen, diesem das Bild und dessen Bedeutung. In seinen weltgeschichtlichen Gedanken hatte Nebukadnezar eine Riesengestalt gesehen mit goldenem Haupt, silberner Brust und Armen, kupfernem Bauch und Lenden, eisernen Schenkeln und eisernen und tönernen Füßen, die in zehn Zehen ausliefen. Da wurde ein Stein ohne Hände abgerissen; der schlug unten an die Füße, so daß das Bild umfiel und völlig bis zum Haupt hin zerbröckelte. Und nun die Deutung. Da Daniel ausdrücklich zu Nebukadnezar sagt: „Du bist das goldene Haupt“, B. 38, das goldene Haupt also das babylonische Weltreich bedeutet, so können die übrigen von Daniel beschriebenen Königreiche nichts anderes sein als die späteren Weltreiche, wie sie nacheinander auf den Schauplatz der Geschichte traten. Die Brust und die Arme von Silber bedeuten dann das von Cyrus gegründete medo-persische Reich, der kupferne Bauch und die Lenden das von Alexander dem Großen geschaffene griechisch-mazedonische Weltreich, die eisernen Schenkel das römische Weltreich, und die ausdrücklich genannten zehn Zehen, B. 42, die, wie wir noch sehen werden, den zehn Hörnern in der späteren Vision Daniels, Kap. 7, entsprechen, bedeuten zehn Reiche, die aus dem römischen Weltreich hervorgehen. Und der Stein ist, wie B. 44 ausdrücklich gesagt wird, das göttliche Reich: „Aber zur Zeit solcher Königreiche wird Gott vom Himmel ein Königreich aufrichten, das nimmermehr zerstört wird, und sein Königreich wird auf kein ander Volk kommen. Es wird alle diese Königreiche zermalmen und zerstören, aber es wird ewiglich bleiben.“ Alle die großen Weltreiche mit allen ihren imperialistischen Bestrebungen müssen zertrümmert wer-

den, und auf ihren Trümmern baut sich auf das ewige Messiasreich, die eine heilige christliche Kirche hier in der Zeit und dort in Ewigkeit, Offenb. 11, 15; 12, 10; 19, 6. Die herabsinkende Schilderung vom Gold zum Silber, dann zum Kupfer, endlich zum Eisen und Zinn sowie auch die herabsinkende Stufe der Körperglieder vom Haupt zur Brust, dann zum Bauch, endlich zu den Füßen, deutet wohl an, daß diese Weltreiche in ihrer Art immer unedler, aber auch immer härter und doch zuletzt morsch und zerbrechlich sein werden. Die Teilung von Brust und Armen geht auf die Zerteilung des Reiches in Medien und Persien. Wie dann der Bauch in zwei Lenden sich spaltet, so teilte sich das dritte Weltreich in Griechenland und Mazedonien. Die zwei Beine entsprechen der Zerteilung des römischen Reiches in das weströmische und oströmische Reich, und daß Zinn unter das Eisen gemischt ist, bedeutet, daß das Römerreich im Laufe der Geschichte seine Eisennatur mehr und mehr verliert. Es ist aber immer noch da, das weströmische im Papst, das oströmische in den Türken. Die Zahl der zehn Reichen wird wohl hervorgehoben, aber nicht weiter ausgedeutet, außer daß es die Ausläufer des Römerreichs sind. Wenn man fragt, wie man öfters gefragt hat, wie sich denn die zehn Ausläufer in historischen Reichen erkennen lassen, so ist zu antworten, daß sie sich erst endgültig bestimmen lassen, wenn alles erfüllt ist. Aber schon Hofmann hat auf die Aussage B. 43 hingewiesen: „Sie werden sich wohl nach Menschengelut untereinander mengen, aber sie werden doch nicht aneinander halten“, wo unter den sich Vermischenden offenbar Könige und deren Verschwägerungen verstanden werden sollen. Er sagt in seinem seinerzeit epochemachenden Erstlingswerke: „Römisches und noch Späteres vermengte sich; sollte bei letzterem nicht an Germanisches und Slawisches zu denken sein? Als die Deutschen und Slaven teils auf den Grund und Boden, teils wenigstens in die weltgeschichtliche Stelle des römischen Reichs einrückten, verschwägerten sich ihre Fürsten mit römischen Familien. Kaiser Karl stammte aus romanischem Hause, und fast zu gleicher Zeit haben sich der deutsche Kaiser Otto II. und der russische Großfürst Wladimir mit Töchtern oströmischer Kaiser vermählt. Es war dies bezeichnend für das Verhältnis der nachrückenden Völker zu Rom überhaupt: sie haben kein neues Reich gestiftet, sondern das römische fortgesetzt. Und so bleibt es bis ans Ende aller Weltmacht, bis zu ihrem schließlichen Auslaufe in zehn Herrschaften, welche jetzt nachweisen zu wollen ebenso verkehrt wäre, als wenn man die Wiederkunft Christi auf morgen oder übermorgen ansagen wollte.“²²⁾ Buseby zitiert diese Ausföhrung zustimmend und fügt dem letzten Satz: „To attempt now to mark out these kingdoms would be as misplaced as to fix tomorrow or the next day the coming of Christ“ die treffende Bemerkung hinzu: „with which they stand connected.“²³⁾

Aber wie dem auch sein mag: Lassen wir nicht außer Augen, daß

22) Weisagung und Erfüllung, 1, 281. 282.

23) Daniel the Prophet, 121.

Daniel eben eigentlich nur vier Weltreiche weisagt. Dazu paßt auch gerade die Zahl vier; denn vier ist, wie man richtig gesagt hat und allgemein zugesteht, die Zahl der „Ökumenizität“ oder Allgemeinheit. Vgl. das in den „Kleinen Gesefelsstudien“ in dieser Zeitschrift darüber Ausgeführte, Märzheft 1936, S. 179; Juniheft, S. 422. Deshalb fühlte sich auch das Germanenreich, als es das Erbe des Römerreichs antrat, nicht als ein neues Reich, sondern als Fortsetzung des Römerreichs in anderer Gestalt, wie auch der bekannte Name besagte „das Heilige Römische Reich Deutscher Nation“, das erst 1806 zugrunde ging.

Nebukadnezar ist von dieser Offenbarung des Geheimnisses ganz ergriffen. Er huldigt dem Gott der Götter, dessen Prophet und Vertreter vor ihm stand. Er bekennt: „Es ist kein Zweifel, euer Gott ist ein Gott über alle Götter und ein Herr über alle Könige, der da kann verborgene Dinge offenbaren“, B. 47. Und er belohnt den Daniel, indem er ihn zum Fürsten setzt über die ganze Landschaft Babylon und ihn zum Obersten macht über alle Weisen zu Babel.

Gottes Wundermacht im Feuerofen. Kap. 3

Nebukadnezar hat sich freilich nicht durch seine erste Erfahrung von der Größe des lebendigen Gottes auf die Dauer belehren und vom Götzendienst befehlen lassen. Wir wissen ja überhaupt nichts Genaueres über die Umwandlung der im Danielbuche erwähnten Großkönige, und das darüber Berichtete kann kaum als eine völlige Bekehrung aufgefaßt werden. Vgl. das im Aprilheft dieser Zeitschrift, S. 277, Bemerkte. Oder es war bei ihnen wie bei den Einwohnern Ninives und deren König. Sie fielen wieder zurück in das heidnische Wesen; denn die Zeit des Neuen Testaments, da die Heiden in Scharen in die Kirche eingehen sollten, war noch nicht gekommen. Dies läßt sich gerade auch aus diesem dritten Kapitel erkennen. Nach heidnischer Anschauung zeigte der Sieg eines Volkes über andere Völker deutlich an, daß der Gott der Sieger den Göttern der Besiegten überlegen sei. Wie spottet z. B. der Erzschenke und Feldherr des assyrischen Königs den Israeliten gegenüber über die Götter der besiegten Völker und über den Gott Israels, 2 Kön. 19, 10–13; Jes. 37, 10–14! So wurde der Gott der Sieger zum Hauptgott des Reichs, und die Götter der eroberten Länder sanken herab auf die Stufe niederer Götter. Dies will nun Nebukadnezar in seinem Weltreich zur Anerkennung bringen. Die Staatsklugheit hat eben je und je in der Einheit der Religion ein ausgezeichnetes Band zur Vereinigung aller Bürger eines großen Reiches erkannt. Darum veranstaltet der König zu einer bestimmten Zeit eine großartige politische und zugleich religiöse Feier. Alle höheren Reichsbeamten sollen zusammenkommen und die Einheit des Reiches, das aus so vielen Völkern bestand, dadurch zum Ausdruck bringen, daß sie alle zu gleicher Stunde wie aus einem Munde dem einen Herrscher und seinem Reichsgott huldigen. So ließ Nebukadnezar in der Ebene Dura, in der Landschaft Babel, eine riesige goldene oder vergoldete Bildsäule errichten. Entweder war es sein

eigenes Standbild oder eine Bildsäule des Stadtgottes von Babel, Mar-
duk oder Merodach, oder überhaupt ein Sinnbild Babylons. Dieses
Götzenbild sollte durch seine Riesengröße und seinen Goldglanz Zeugnis
ablegen von der Größe und Macht des babylonischen Reichsgottes, der
dem König den Sieg über alle seine Feinde verliehen hatte, und sollte so
eine Art Siegesdenkmal zur Verherrlichung des babylonischen Weltreichs
sein. Es war ein großartiges Schauspiel, das sich zur festgesetzten
Stunde entfaltete. Auf dem Festplatze funkelte und strahlte das goldene
riesengroße Bildwerk. Ringsherum versammelte sich der Hof mit dem
König, den hohen Beamten, die Stadthalter und Landpfleger, die Be-
fehlshaber und Amtsleute, die Steuereinnnehmer und Schatzmeister, die
Oberrichter und die Rechtsgelehrten. Dazu kam dann die große Menge
des Volkes. Und nun tritt der Herold hervor und ruft mit Macht: So-
bald die Musik ertönt, sollt ihr niederfallen und das Bild anbeten. Das
konnten auch alle nichtbabylonischen Heiden ganz leicht tun. Nach babyl-
onischer religiöser Anschauung konnte jeder in seinem eigenen Gott eine
Manifestation, eine Offenbarung, der Gottheit erkennen und darum
seinen eigenen Gott als den höchsten verehren. Und so fällt die ganze
Menge anbetend auf die Knie. Nur in Israels heiligem Gesetz steht das
Wort: „Du sollst keine andern Götter neben mir haben“, 2 Mos. 20, 3.
Darum beteiligten Daniels drei Freunde sich nicht daran.

Wo war aber Daniel an diesem Tage? Das wissen wir nicht und
können nur Vermutungen aussprechen. Vielleicht war er krank (wir
lesen öfters, daß er ganz ergriffen war in Folge der ihm zuteil werdenden
Widerfahrnisse und Offenbarungen, Kap. 4, 16; 7, 28; 8, 17. 18. 27;
10, 3), oder er war verreist und vielleicht in Regierungsgeschäften ab-
wesend; aber ganz gewiß dürfen wir nach seinem ganzen Leben und
Wirken nicht denken an Kreuzesflucht und Kreuzesflucht. Und nun trägt
sich die Geschichte zu, die jedem Bibelleser bekannt ist, und ein großes
Wunder geschieht, ein Wunder, über das der Unglaube je und je gespottet
hat, das aber auch durch das Neue Testament bezeugt ist. Denn in dem
großen 11. Kapitel des Hebräerbriefts vom seligmachenden Glauben wer-
den auch diese Glaubenshelden, Sadrach, Mesach und Abednego, wenn
auch nicht mit ausdrücklicher Namensnennung, erwähnt, und es wird
bezeugt, daß sie durch den Glauben des Feuers Macht ausgelöscht haben,
B. 34. Und die Folge davon ist, daß Nebukadnezar dem wahren Gott
die Ehre gibt, der seinen Engel gesandt und seine Knechte errettet hat,
jeden, der diesen Gott lästern wird, mit der Todesstrafe bedroht und den
drei treuen Befennern große Gewalt gibt, B. 28–30.

Vielleicht aber dürfen wir hier noch, ehe wir zum nächsten Kapitel
übergehen, einen kleinen Exkurs einfügen über eine Sache, die schon viel
verhandelt und immer auch als ein Argument gegen die Entstehung des
Buches Daniel im Exil oder gleich nach dem Exil geltend gemacht wor-
den ist. In diesem Bericht von der Weihe des großen Bildes wird näm-
lich angekündigt: „Wenn ihr hören werdet den Schall der Posaunen,
Trommeten, Harfen, Geigen, Psalter, Lauten und allerlei Saitenspiel,

so sollt ihr niederfallen und das guldene Bild anbeten, das der König Nebukadnegar hat setzen lassen", B. 5, und diese Instrumente werden dann B. 7, 10 und 15 noch einmal genannt. Ein Blick auf den aramäischen Grundtext zeigt, daß dies zum Teil besondere Musikinstrumente waren, die Luther in rechter Weise mit Ausdrücken, die in der deutschen Sprache gang und gäbe sind, wiedergegeben hat, gerade wie auch die englische Bibel von "cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of music" redet. Wenn man dann diese Namen genauer untersucht, so stellt sich bald heraus, daß einige dieser Bezeichnungen ursprünglich griechische Worte sind, die in aramäischer Form gegeben werden. Und da behauptet nun die Kritik, daß dies ein klarer Beweis sei der späten Entstehung des Danielbuches. Diese griechischen Ausdrücke seien nur erklärlich in einer Zeit, da die griechische Sprache die Weltsprache geworden sei. Der Schreiber müsse also erst nach Alexander dem Großen gelebt haben, in der Makkabäerzeit, wie z. B. Driver sich ausdrückt: "The Greek words demand a date after the conquest of Palestine by Alexander the Great."²⁴

Was läßt sich auf dieses Argument erwidern? Zunächst sei bemerkt, daß dies nicht erst neuerdings erkannt worden ist, sondern daß schon der alte treffliche Calov in seinem *Criticus Sacer Veteris Testamenti* auf diesen Punkt eingeht. Aber Tatsache ist, daß das aramäische Wort für „Lauten“, dulcimer, קִנֹּרָא, offenbar das griechische Wort συμφωνία, Symphonie, ist; Psalter, psaltery, פְּסַלְטֵרִי, ist das griechische ψαλτήριον, Saitenspiel, חֲרִצִּי, „Harfen“, harp, ist die griechische κιθάρα oder κιθάρα, Zither; und סַבְכֻּבִּי, „Geigen“, sackbut, ist das griechische σαμβύκη, ein dreieckiges Instrument von scharfem, hellem Ton. Es sind also lauter spezielle, technische Ausdrücke. Und nun ist es ja allgemein bekannt, daß gerade termini technici aus einer Sprache leicht in eine andere Sprache übergehen. Engländische Schriftsteller gebrauchen den Ausdruck „Hinterland“ für den Teil Afrikas, der hinter der Küste liegt. Rider Haggard gebraucht holländische Ausdrücke wie trek und laager, die überhaupt in die englische Sprache übergegangen sind. Namentlich bekannt ist, wie häufig Thomas Carlyle deutsche Worte und Phrasen anwendet und den Stil von Jean Paul F. Richter nachahmt. Bei dem vielfachen Verkehr, der zwischen den Griechen und Asiaten stattfand, ist es nicht nur denkbar und möglich, sondern sogar wahrscheinlich, daß solche Ausdrücke aus der einen Sprache in die andere übergingen, und die Vermutung Wilsons und Boutflower's mag zutreffen, daß diese griechischen Wörter durch griechische Söldner an Nebukadnegars Hof gebracht worden seien.²⁵ Der schon genannte Baumgärtner, gerade eine Autorität hinsichtlich des Aramäischen im Daniel, bemerkt freilich, daß griechische Wörter „in den Texten des 5. Jahrhunderts fast ganz fehlen und

²⁴) *Century Bible*, Daniel, LXIII.

²⁵) Wilson, *The Aramaic of Daniel*, 301; Boutflower, *In and around the Book of Daniel*, 246.

auch nachher nur spärlich vertreten sind“, aber sie kommen doch vor; und andere Gelehrte, wie Sachau, Ungnad, Cowley, verweisen namentlich auf die in neuerer Zeit aufgefundenen aramäischen Papyri von Elephantine mit ihren griechischen Wörtern.²⁶⁾ Und wenn man sagt, daß erst der griechische Historiker Polybius im zweiten Jahrhundert vor Christo die σιγῶνα erwähne und daß der erst in der Makkabäerzeit lebende syrische Tyrann Antiochus Epiphanes damit aufgetreten sei und getanzet habe, so beweist das nicht, daß dieser erst dieses Instrument erfunden habe. Schon der bekannte englische Ausgraber Layard soll in seinem Werk *Discoveries among the Ruins of Nineveh and Babylon* — das Buch ist mir nicht zugänglich — mitgeteilt haben, daß auf den Monumenten des Sanherib sich das Bild eines σιγῶνος finde.

Wir haben gerade diesen Punkt, weil es ein interessantes Moment ist, herausgegriffen als Beweis, daß die Argumente der modernen Kritik gegen die Echtheit des Buches Daniel sich wohl widerlegen lassen.

L. Fürbringer

The Voyage of the Saxons

In view of the fact that the approaching centennial celebration of the Saxon immigration will require a more than casual acquaintance with the chief incidents connected with this memorable historical event, we shall certainly all profit by a rehearsal and a re-study of the more significant features of this unique undertaking on the part of these Lutheran colonists. Such a study is especially necessary in view of the fact that many of the old histories are no longer generally available or accessible and that some of the printed accounts, such as that by Hochstetter, do not give much detailed information as to individual features of the immigration. It is the intention of this article therefore, as well as that of a few others which will follow at intervals, to offer to our readers such information as may enable them to form a clearer picture of the events connected with the coming of the Saxons, so that the information may properly be utilized in various teaching situations.

The preliminary history of the momentous historical event, the first instance of such an emigration on account of religion, may be summarized briefly. Pastor Stephan, having for a number of years declared that he was merely waiting for some sign from the Lord indicating that the time for the leave-taking had come, stated early in 1838, not only to the members of his congregation, but also to others who had been informed of a possible emigration, that the hour had come. By September 4, 1838, a total of 707 persons had made announcement that they were ready to join the group of

26) Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 4 (1927), 127.

emigrants. Of these, 240 hailed from Dresden and vicinity, 31 from Leipzig, 109 from Frohna, where Keyl was pastor, 84 from Lunzenau, near Rochlitz, the parish of Pastor Buerger, 108 from Eichenberg, near Cahla, also from Naumburg and Halle, 48 from Paitzdorf and vicinity, where Gruber was pastor, 16 from Langenchursdorf, the parish of the elder Pastor Walther, 19 from Braunsdorf, where the younger Walther was pastor, and others from other sections of the country. Only 665 actually left Bremen on the chartered vessels. All these emigrants placed their funds in a common treasury, which contained 123,987 thaler in cash. Preachers, school-teachers, officials, resigned their positions, farmers sold their land, lawyers and physicians gave up their practise, artisans and craftsmen laid down their tools; yes, it even happened that married people left their spouses, parents their children, and *vice versa*. A few country girls whose parents had refused their permission for them to leave, so that they could not obtain a passport, left their homes in the disguise of students or of young ladies of leisure, and many of these made the journey to Bremen afoot in order to be able to join the group which rallied under the leadership of Stephan.¹⁾

For some of the emigrants the trip by water began even in Saxony, as we learn from the diary of Johann Friedrich Buenger, the leader of this group, from which we quote the following sentences: "October 20, 1838. At noon, at 12:30, was the important moment when our deliverance began. There were only 44 persons on board, since some, on account of their passports, could not as yet go along. Upon previous request thanksgiving was offered to the Lord Jesus Christ with one accord, but quietly, for the hour of deliverance which had now come, and a prayer was offered up to Him, the Lord of the Church, for His gracious presence, His protection and guidance on the journey, together with the plea that He would deliver also those who were left behind and guide them safely till they might join us. . . . At Priesnitz we found the first boat, which had already left on October 18, but had been detained by a storm. Beneath the deck the following arrangements were made. The entire steerage was divided into three sections, separated by walls of packing-cases. In the section next to the cabin the families received their quarters, in the second the unmarried women, in the third the unmarried men. Just before ten o'clock two additional passengers came. — October 21. Today was Sunday. At ten o'clock we assembled for divine service. In order not to cause disturbance, we did not sing. I read the *Kyrie*, 'All Glory Be to God on High,' etc., and Pastor Stephan

1) Koestering, *Auswanderung der saechsischen Lutheraner*, 13.

preached a sermon. It was very comforting to us that the Gospel for this day, the 19th Sunday after Trinity, Matt. 9:1, began with the words 'And He entered into a ship and passed over.' After the sermon followed the General Confession, the Lord's Prayer, a short prayer taking into account the present circumstances, and finally the hymn from the old Leipzig hymnal (No. 675): 'In Jesus' name we go our way, His holy angel be our stay, As when, in cruel Pharaoh's land, His people fled the tyrant's hand.' . . . October 22. After the morning devotion I had a catechism lesson with the children on the First Commandment. Toward eleven o'clock we landed at Muehlberg. The customs officers were very kind. They visited both boats but did not ask for our passports, which suited us very well; for there was contraband in our midst, since some did not as yet have their passports. . . . October 23. After the morning devotion a catechization on the Second Commandment. The children were attentive. Because of the approaching Reformation Festival and the nearness of the city of Wittenberg I began to relate the story of the Reformation to the children. . . . In the sixth hour (in the afternoon) we sighted the two main spires of Wittenberg. . . . October 24. Early in the morning catechization on our boat on the Third Commandment, in the afternoon on the other boat on the Second. . . . October 25. Morning devotion. Catechization on the Fourth Commandment. Life of Luther. Arrival at Magdeburg."

Buenger's diary continues recording the chief events from day to day. On October 27 he became ill and felt as though he must die. To Pastor O. H. Walther he wrote on November 2 that he hoped to get at least as far as Bremen. He was then still at Harburg, where he had remained in an inn. But on November 6 he had recovered sufficiently to continue his journey, and on the afternoon of November 7 he arrived in Bremen. Here his joy was turned into consternation when he found that his mother had been taken into custody, the allegation against her being that she had abducted two orphans without the consent of their guardian. In spite of all his efforts in her behalf he could not obtain her release and was therefore obliged to say farewell also to the last of the vessels that were conveying the emigrants across the sea. It was not until December 11 that Buenger's mother was released. This accounts for the fact that Buenger came to New York on the *Constitution*, which left Bremen on December 21, 1838, and reached New York on February 18, 1839. The small group of Lutherans whom Buenger found here, some hundred souls, traveled with him, at Pastor Stephan's suggestion, and joined the colonists in Perry County shortly after Pentecost in the year 1839.²⁾

2) *Lutheraner*, XXXVIII, 68 ff.

Meanwhile the other colonists had carried out their plans. They had chartered four vessels for their exclusive use. On a fifth ship members of their group occupied all but three places. The first ship to leave Bremen was the *Copernicus*, which weighed anchor on November 3 and reached New Orleans on December 31, 1838. Pastor Buerger officiated on this ship. The second vessel was the *Johann Georg*, which also left Bremen on November 3, but did not reach New Orleans until January 5, 1839. Pastors Keyl and the younger Walther officiated on this ship. The third ship was the *Republik*, which left Bremen on November 12 and landed at New Orleans on January 12, 1839. On this boat Pastor Loeber officiated. The fourth vessel was the *Olbers*, which left Bremen on November 18 and reached New Orleans on January 20, 1839. Pastors Stephan and Otto Herman Walther were on this boat. The fifth ship was the *Amalia*, which also left Bremen on November 18, but was lost at sea. We may remark, in passing, that the failure of this ship to reach port caused the deepest grief and sorrow among the emigrants, and Pastor Herman Walther composed a beautiful poem whose first stanza reads:

Lord Jesus, Lord Jesus, the ship has not come,
 The ship named *Amalia* is missing!
 When wilt Thou, O Pilot, convey her back home
 From the storms that are howling and hissing?
 Have we, Lord, been favored Thy mercies to share?
 Was their ship too small for Thy kindness and care?
 Lord Jesus, come, quiet our yearning
 And hasten *Amalia's* returning.³⁾

The various events of the ocean voyage were preserved in note-books and diaries, especially by a Mr. G. Guenther, whose accounts were embodied in a small volume, which appeared in Dresden in 1839, entitled *Die Schicksale und Abenteuer der aus Sachsen ausgewanderten Stephanianer*. These accounts are here drawn upon; they refer to the voyage of the *Olbers*.

On November 18, at ten o'clock in the morning, the *Olbers* set sail with a most favorable wind, and the assurance created by this fact provided ample opportunity for reflections. The ship sailed so rapidly that within forty hours it had passed through the Strait of Calais (Dover), an unusual performance, as Captain Henry Exter informed the company.

But seasickness soon made its appearance and created great havoc. On November 20 death claimed its first victim of the voyage, for the little son of Dr. M—ch (Marbach), only three years old, was stricken with heart-failure. Because of the official standing of the father, and since the circumstances were otherwise un-

3) Graebner, Theo., *Our Pilgrim Fathers*, 13.

usual, the captain made an exception with respect to the customary mode of burial at sea. The ship's carpenter prepared a little coffin, and in this the body of the beloved child was solemnly delivered to the waves. Upon this occasion Pastor Stephan delivered a touching address. And indeed, the experience must have been a most heartrending one to the bereaved parents as they gazed after the body of their beloved son whose little form was thus entrusted to the foaming sea — they were not even privileged to give adequate expression to their grief at some green mound in the churchyard. The *Olbers* sailed on as night was falling, and through the gathering darkness the cradle-song of the emigrants was wafted across the sea:

Now rest, my child, and slumber,
No cares thy bed encumber
As falls the shelt'ring night;
Our ship its way is going,
Our Pilot's light is glowing,
Our Jesus, with His mercy bright.

On November 21 contrary winds arose, which soon developed into a violent storm. The ship was then in the Bay of Biscay, and the passengers for the first time had the fearsome spectacle of a storm at sea. However, the danger passed by without an accident to the ship or the passengers. The weather grew more moderate, and the sea calmed down. On Sunday, November 25, the captain called attention to the frequent currents from the west, which kept the sea in constant motion and prevented the conducting of divine services for the entire group. On Tuesday, November 27, the storm again began to rage; all hatches were closed, and no one was permitted on deck. When the storm reached its height, on November 28, two sailors were torn from the wheel, and one of them was severely wounded. But then the storm gradually abated.

The voyage, even at this time, was not without its humorous interludes. Owing to a casual remark on the part of a good woman from Dresden concerning the delectableness of potato dumplings the entire group in the steerage was seized with a desire for this Old World delicacy, and the cry arose from all sides, "We want potato dumplings!" As a result the entire company, including the men, who were promptly equipped with aprons, went to work paring and grating potatoes, which were then, with the proper amount of other ingredients, formed into dumplings and cooked in an immense kettle. In spite of a few difficulties which were encountered in the festival of cooking, the first batch of dumplings was finished at two o'clock and the second at four, and the chronicler records that the feast was a huge success, though the dumplings, under the circumstances, were somewhat heavy and fairly hard to digest.

Since the Advent season had now begun, the devotions took cognizance of its significance. The impression of the sacred season was heightened by the circumstances in which the emigrants found themselves, the perils of the sea, the spectacle of death in their own midst, and the uncertainty of the future. With great fervor all joined in the hymn written especially for this occasion, the third stanza of which may be rendered thus:

Come, O Jesus, enter in;
See, our ship holds wide its portals.
Come, Thy mercy live within;
Grant Thy grace to sinful mortals.
Be our Pilot and our Guide;
Do Thou never leave our side.

On December 4 a favorable wind was blowing, so that the *Olbers* was able to pass from the Bay of Biscay to the great Atlantic Ocean. Since the sailors had stored the casks with drinking-water in the hold of the ship and the company was now in need of fresh water, all the cases and boxes in the steerage had to be moved, a procedure which caused considerable annoyance to the passengers. On December 5 both the sea and the wind were perfectly calm, and therefore it was possible to have an Advent service, which was conducted by Pastor Walther. In the evening there was a service with prayer and singing, and this became a regular custom. On these occasions the Saxons used either the hymn-books from Chemnitz and Breslau or the *Songs of the Exiles*, which had been composed for their particular needs. Pastor Walther used his poetical talent, as occasion required, in writing suitable poems and hymns for the emigrants. Since the number of hymnals did not suffice for the entire group, the minister would read the verses to the congregation as they were to be sung. If the weather was at all favorable, the services were conducted on the upper deck, a place which was certainly suitable for such solemn acts, as there was nothing in sight to distract the attention of the assembly. On December 9 Pastor Stephan delivered the sermon, which, as usual, made a very deep impression on his hearers. The weather on this Sunday was unusually beautiful, the atmosphere being as balmy as on a summer-day. Provision was made for the instruction of the children, and classes were conducted regularly by one or the other of the ministerial candidates.

On the afternoon of December 13 the ship encountered a severe thunder-shower, although the forenoon had been calm. But the wind became favorable, and the *Olbers* was able to cover approximately fifty English miles in four hours. On Sunday, December 16, Pastor Walther conducted services on the open deck. But hardly had he begun his sermon on the theme "Why Have We Emigrated?"

when a sudden squall of wind and rain interrupted the address, and every one hurried to the shelter of the steerage. The sermon was concluded in connection with the evening devotions. Later in the evening Pastor Stephan addressed the emigrants. On December 18 the weather was beautiful, so that all the steerage passengers were able to be on deck.

On Wednesday, December 19, the two-year-old son of the miller Zeibig died of teething trouble, and the body of the child was committed to the ocean the same evening, Pastor Walther conducting the services.

At this time some difficulties were encountered because there was such a great diversity in the manner of conducting individual devotions. Apparently every family had its own book of worship, and there was little uniformity. Therefore it was decided that hereafter there would be a common devotional service every morning at eight o'clock, all steerage passengers taking part in a body. This arrangement also prevented the offense given or taken when individuals who had finished their own devotions were engaged in some other occupation.

On Sunday, December 23, the constant rocking of the ship made it impossible to conduct services in the morning, which were therefore postponed to the evening. On this day the passengers saw the first specimens of flying-fish, which use their forward fins to soar or flutter above the waves when they are pursued by predatory fishes or mammals. A school of porpoises was also sighted, which followed the vessel for some time. All this brought a welcome diversion into the monotony of the voyage.

On Christmas Day the weather was very warm and pleasant, and many of the emigrants drew comparisons between these conditions and those in their old home, where the frost was painting pictures on the windows, while a sultry summer heat was prevailing on the *Olbers*. The festival sermon was delivered by Pastor Stephan, and the assembly sang a hymn written for the occasion, which was sung with fervor not unmingled with a certain sadness or melancholy, as a trace of homesickness insisted on making itself felt. Two stanzas from this hymn may be rendered as follows:

So we rejoice this Christmas Day
As o'er the sea we take our way,
Where angels from the sky above
Make known to us the Savior's love.

Lord Jesus, sweet and holy Child,
Oh, enter with Thy mercy mild.
This vessel, with Thy presence blest,
A manger be for Thee to rest.

Second Christmas Day proved unlucky for one of the passengers, a certain Mr. Klemm. In passing from the dining-room

to the cabin, he stepped over a bench and in doing so fell down an open hatchway into the hold of the ship. A medical examination showed that he had broken two ribs and sustained other injuries, which necessitated the attention of the company's physician, Dr. Schnabel. Pastor Walther made special reference to the unfortunate incident in the evening devotion.

On Sunday, December 30, some unpleasantness was again caused by the fact that the sailors were obliged to get more water out of the hold of the ship. Some of the passengers seemed to be considerably agitated over the fact that this work had to be done on a Sunday. On the following day, New Year's Eve, Pastor Walther took occasion, in connection with the customary devotion, to conduct a meditation on the end of the year, closing his address with words of hope concerning the new year. The expectation of soon having a view of the "promised land" was a strong factor in strengthening the hearts of the emigrants at that time.

On Wednesday, January 2, the ship was completely becalmed. The ship's carpenter on this day harpooned a dolphin, a procedure which was followed with great interest by the entire ship's company. On the following day, however, a severe thunder-shower, with heavy rain, swept over the ocean. On January 4 the island of Porto Rico was sighted, but the distance was too great to permit a distinct view of objects. At midnight another violent thunder-storm came up, a most awe-inspiring sight, especially when the billows rose in menacing masses. The storm was followed by a complete calm, and small waves curled about the ship in a delightful murmur, while thousands of stars gleamed in the firmament above and were reflected in the quiet surface of the sea.

On Sunday, January 6, at two o'clock in the morning, the *Olbers* approached the coast of Santo Domingo. On this day another storm interfered with the conducting of religious services. The vessel was so close to land that the passengers could distinguish the individual trees. The emigrants were delighted with the privilege, so long denied them, of seeing land, and since contrary winds compelled the captain to resort to tacking for three days, all passengers availed themselves of the opportunity to enjoy the sight of land. On the afternoon of January 10 a more favorable wind filled the sails of the *Olbers*; Santo Domingo fell away behind, and the island of Cuba rose before the eyes of the passengers. As the vessel sailed close to the beautiful island, every one could enjoy to the full the marvelous landscape with its fertile plantations and romantic mountain ranges.

A most distressing incident occurred on January 11, when it was found necessary to discipline a lad of about nine years who

had stolen several watches from passengers and had then, by his own confession, destroyed them and thrown them into the water.

On Sunday, January 13, a storm again prevented the conducting of the full morning service, so that only the Gospel of the day was read. But in the evening the *Olbers* entered the Gulf of Mexico, and progress became steady and rapid. At this time the emigrants began to make definite plans regarding their new home. A preliminary organization was also effected, and Pastor Stephan was, on January 15, elected bishop of the congregation.

Early on Friday morning, January 18, the *Olbers* approached the mouth of the Mississippi. But the progress of the ship had been so rapid that it was necessary to turn back into deeper water in order to avoid danger; for there was as yet no pilot on board. At last, at nine o'clock in the morning, the pilot arrived. He quickly leaped into a small boat, manned by Negro oarsmen, and was rowed over to the *Olbers*. The pilot was a tall, gaunt man, with a characteristic, deeply lined face. He at once took command and soon directed the vessel on the right course, while his colored servants, after a good deal of attention paid to him on the part of the passengers, rowed back to the pilot boat. About noon the steamboat *Tiger of New Orleans* came down the river to meet the *Olbers*, and a five-inch tow-rope was attached to the sailboat in order to take it up the river. But suddenly the rope parted, and the *Olbers* ran aground on a mud bar. All attempts to move the boat failed, and in addition a thunder-shower was followed by a heavy fog, which greatly interfered with the work.

The *Olbers* was compelled to remain on the mud bar until Saturday afternoon. The cargo, which consisted of 40,000 bricks, had to be shifted from one end of the ship to the other, a task which was undertaken with the help of the steerage-passengers. With the help of a second steamer, the *Hudson*, the vessel was finally set afloat, and the eighty-mile trip to New Orleans could be resumed.

On Sunday afternoon, January 20, at four o'clock, the harbor of New Orleans lay before the eyes of the immigrants, and at five o'clock the *Olbers* docked. But orders had been given that no one was to leave the ship that evening, and so the immigrants had to be satisfied with a distant view of the city and its people. The people of the city, on their part, felt no restraint about trying to visit the *Olbers*, and it was necessary to place men at both hatchways to keep the inquisitive intruders from entering the cabins.

On the next day, when permission was given to the passengers to land, they promptly availed themselves of the opportunity to walk on solid ground once more and to enjoy the sights of the city. Their impression of the great commercial city was not wholly

favorable, and most of them were particularly repulsed by the evils connected with slavery, which were in evidence on all sides and seemed to have a demoralizing influence on social conditions in general. The extant records do not indicate how many of the Saxons who had reached New Orleans on December 31, 1838, and January 5 and 12, 1839, remained in that city to wait for the *Olbers* and the *Amalia*; but one may assume that the majority of the immigrants stayed in the South for the present, although a remark made by Guenther (p. 31) seems to show that some members of the group reached St. Louis early in February.

Several incidents during the stay in New Orleans were noted by the chronicler. On January 23 another passenger was added to the list in the person of a baby daughter born to the shoemaker Niemann of Dresden. A somewhat provoking interlude was furnished by a man who impersonated a customs collector and pocketed ten dollars in addition to a fine meal which he was served. After the real customs officer had inspected the property of the immigrants, arrangements were made to transfer all the paraphernalia from the *Olbers* to a river steamer. This work was begun on January 26, at nine o'clock in the morning, but could not be finished on that day, so that it became necessary to complete the transshipment by wagon on the following Monday. After the transfer had been completed, there was another delay because Dr. Schnabel, who had functioned as physician to the company and intended to remain in New Orleans, insisted on receiving payment for his services. Only on Thursday, January 31, was it possible for the steamer *Selma* to begin its trip to St. Louis.

The journey up the Mississippi was uneventful until the boat reached the mud bar at the mouth of the Ohio, where it ran aground. Since the river was at low stage, there seemed to be no chance for the *Selma* to be set afloat in a short time. So the passengers went on shore and made short excursions into the surrounding woods. There was also a beautiful farm near by, whose proprietor showed the immigrants much consideration, especially by giving them one of his Negro men as guide. At that time Carolina parakeets were still abundant in that neighborhood, and of these many were shot, for they made a most delectable meal. But beyond the farmland was a marshy country, which was said to be frequented by various wild animals, and for this reason the company preferred to return to the boat. The immigrants were also much interested in the manner in which the farms were cleared, namely, by burning off the woods, and they were given an opportunity to assist in some work of this kind.

After several days a few of the leaders, Dr. Marbach and Candidates Kluegel and Froehlich, took passage on a small steamer, the *Brazil*, in order to go to St. Louis and complete arrangements

for the arrival of the entire company. On February 14 the trip of the *Selma* could be resumed; but after five miles it ran aground with such force as to throw one of the ship's firemen down a hatch and the nine-year-old son of one of the passengers, by the name of Barthel, into the river. Fortunately one of the sailors immediately jumped in after the boy and rescued him. The captain now boarded one of the small steamers which plied the river in order to charter some small steamers at St. Louis for the purpose of setting the *Selma* afloat again. In the absence of the captain the crew of the boat, under the direction of the mates, determined to move the steamer over the mud bar. This they managed to do by using the full capacity of the boilers and then shifting the weight of some heavy chains and of the passengers from side to side, so that the vessel was set into a rocking motion and finally managed to crawl over the bad place.

Guenther here remarks: "The journey now continued without hindrance. Everybody was happy over the impending arrival in St. Louis, where the three ships which had preceded them had already arrived. The *Selma* reached this goal on February 19."

Thus ended the voyage of the Saxons. They were in the land of religious liberty.

P. E. KRETZMANN

The Inspiration Question

On November 1, 1937, Lutheran pastors of Washington, D. C., discussed the doctrine of Inspiration on the basis of two essays on "The Inspiration Question," one presented by Dr. H. W. Snyder of the U. L. C. and the other by Rev. Th. P. Fricke of the A. L. C. Dr. G. E. Lenski of Washington was asked "to forward copies of these essays to the theological journals of different bodies for publication." The *Journal of the American Lutheran Conference* received them and published them in the March issue of this year together with introductory remarks by Dr. G. E. Lenski and an "Epilog" by the editor, Dr. J. A. Dell, of the Columbus seminary.

Dr. G. E. Lenski remarks: "The idea underlying this dual presentation was to bring into light any fundamental differences that might serve as barriers and hindrances and sources of controversy in Lutheran church-life. Such differences, though expected, failed to put in their appearance. Unlike our official committees, which have gone forth from their meetings with many headshakings and grumblings, the members of the Washington ministerial group ended their deliberations with the kindest of feelings toward one another and with the earnest conviction that, whereas disunity may exist among Lutherans, it does not exist in the heart of our great Church so far as the Bible itself is con-

cerned." On reading the two essays, we cannot see how Dr. Lenski can say that "such [fundamental] differences, though expected, failed to put in their appearance." Dr. Snyder wrote: "Some of our theologians, on the other hand, accuse the Synodical Conference of lending its weight to the verbal-inspiration theory. Why should we dogmatize where we do not have a positive 'Thus saith the Lord'? . . . Shall we quarrel over an adiaphoron while a sin-sick, needy world is hungering for the Bread of Life?" Pastor Fricke wrote: "The fundamental doctrine of the Christian Church is that of inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures. Let this doctrine be called into question and the foundation of Christian faith is shaken." One man says it is a fundamental doctrine. The other man says it is an adiaphoron. And the third man says that no disunity exists between the first two!

Dr. Snyder states: "There seems to be no question in the mind of Christendom about there being an inspiration, but the manner and extent of it are a matter of dispute." Let us strike out the word "manner." We are not disputing about that. The manner and method of inspiration is a mystery. But we are disputing about the "extent" of it. Here there is a wide disagreement, and a fundamental one. Are the very words of the Bible given by inspiration? Dr. Snyder says, No. Pastor Fricke says, Yes. And Dr. Lenski says these two are agreed. Dr. Snyder's statement: "Then comes the special act of the Holy Spirit, which is the inspiration that qualifies chosen ones to record in human language the content of the message of the Word. This is the *inspiration of the Scriptures*." (Italics in original.) Pastor Fricke's statement: "The thoughts and words are inspired. If the words are not inspired, then there is a vast element which is not inspired; for no thought can be expressed without words, and the entire Bible is made up of words. Thoughts are wedded to words as necessarily as soul to body. On the other hand, if the thought is claimed to be inspired and not the words, the thought can never be certain at any point; for it turns often on a single word and comes to us wholly in words. . . . Too numerous for consideration are the references in Scripture which support the fact of verbal inspiration. . . . 2 Tim. 3:15; . . . Gal. 3:16: St. Paul rests the burden of his powerful argument upon the singular form of the word 'seed.' How could the apostle do this if he was not firmly convinced that every word of Holy Writ, and also its form, was inspired of God? . . . 2 Sam. 23:2, 3: Here David asserts that the words of the Holy Spirit have been transmitted to his tongue. Emphatically he declares his words to be the words of the Holy Ghost. . . ." And the Washington Association got the impression that the two essays are in fundamental agreement!

Just by the way, we wonder if the discussion clarified the meaning of Dr. Snyder's statement that the holy writers "recorded the content of the message of the Word." They got the message of "the Word" and recorded its content. The meaning cannot be that the words which they wrote are divine words, God's very words. The use of the phrase "human language" forbids that. The words of Scripture contain the "message of the Word"—what was this "Word"? Did God tell them to write down certain statements? No; that would be "verbal inspiration." Then what *was* this "Word"? If that was made clear, we wish we could have attended the Washington conference. We have been asking ourselves for years what this "Word" is in contradistinction to the Bible word. We cannot rid ourselves of the idea that this "Word of God" which is said to lie back of Scripture is too hazy a thing to be made the foundation of our faith, particularly as it comes to us in fallible human language.

Dr. Snyder makes this statement: "As one writer on this questions says: 'It [the Bible] has carried with it the husk as well as the kernel,' and in illustration of his meaning he quotes some stories of vengeance, cruelty, *lex talionis*, polygamy, adultery which it relates." What do our Lutherans think of such a statement? Did the conference consider the teaching that parts of the Bible are mere "husk" to be an adiaphoron?

There are some matters broached in Dr. Snyder's essay which are not of fundamental importance, but they might be looked into. For instance: "The Lutheran Church, outside perhaps of the Missouri Synod, has never subscribed to a verbal theory of inspiration." Salvation does not depend on the truth or falsity of this statement; but if it is a false statement, it should not be made. Dr. Dell will presently say something on this adiaphoron. In addition to what he will say, we submit the following statement: "Truly, it is amazing that the adversaries are in no way moved by so many passages of Scripture. . . . Do they think that *these words fell inconsiderately from the Holy Ghost?*" That statement is made in the *Apology* (Trigl., p. 153.) It teaches verbal inspiration. And there are more statements of a similar nature found in the Lutheran Confessions. It is not only the Missouri Synod which teaches verbal inspiration. We submit another statement: "The Holy Scriptures are written by the Holy Ghost. . . . Holy Scripture is God's Word, written and (as I might say) lettered, spelled out in single letters." That is verbal inspiration. It is a statement by Luther, on Ps. 22:7. (IX:1770.) And it is not an isolated statement. The same Luther said: "Holy Scripture is spoken by the Holy Ghost, as I have already often said. . . . The entire Holy Scripture is the Word of the Holy Ghost. . . . First David names the Holy Ghost, 2 Sam. 23:2. To Him he gives all that the prophets

foretell. . . . Therefore these words of David are also the words of the Holy Ghost, which he speaks by the tongue of David." (III:1889-1907.) Luther on the inerrancy of Scripture: "This is certain that Scripture does not lie." (I:714.) "Scripture has never erred. . . . None of the Scripture-writers has ever erred." (Augustine.)" (XV:1481.) "Scripture cannot err." (XIX:1073.) Luther's language is the language of one who believes in verbal inspiration. Dr. Snyder has no right to say: "Luther's attitude on this question was one of freedom." He has no right to say that Luther's teaching on inspiration differs from that of the Missouri Synod.—Luther made such verbal-inspiration statements not once or twice, but a few hundred times. If you will take the time to read Volumes I-IX and XIV of the St. Louis edition of Luther's works, you will find Luther declaring again and again that every word the prophets and apostles wrote is God's Word, that every word is the absolute truth, that the Holy Scriptures are inerrant in every detail. The *Theologische Quartalschrift*, October, 1936, submits a great number of such statements. The writer found "more than a thousand such statements" (p. 246) — in those ten volumes. By the time the writer finishes his survey, there will be not a few more such statements. Men tell us that they can furnish an equal number of statements by Luther which reject verbal inspiration. We ask them to furnish not a thousand, not a hundred, but one single statement by Luther that not every single word of Holy Scripture is inspired, that the holy writers made a single misstatement. They are not able to do that. All of this does not of course *prove* the doctrine of verbal inspiration; but it does prove the falsity of the assertion that such a doctrine is peculiar to the Missouri Synod.

Another matter brought up by Dr. Snyder which has nothing to do with the *doctrine* of inspiration but which needs to be examined as to its historical correctness is this. He says: "The important thing now before us is the fact that inspiration has been injected into the question of further Lutheran unity. . . . One might have expected the question to center in the Galesburg Rules or the controversy over secret orders. But not so; the question of inspiration now occupies, or bids fair soon to occupy, the field. We should not like to charge any Lutheran group with insincerity in its desire for greater Lutheran unity; but can it be possible that, when many other seeming obstacles are being removed, some new one should be trotted out? Were the matter not too serious, one might be reminded of the wag who said, 'If we had some eggs, we could have ham and eggs for breakfast, if we had the ham.'" Dr. Snyder ought to know that the controversy within the Lutheran Church of America on inspiration is not of recent origin. It has been going on for these many years. It began, say in 1871,

when a prominent Lutheran in America had to call attention to the heretical views regarding the inerrancy of Scripture expressed by a prominent Lutheran in America. (See *Lehre und Wehre*, 1871, p. 126.) Furthermore, it was in 1907—and Dr. Snyder surely should be familiar with this—that the General Council adopted a resolution protesting against the charge that the Council had repudiated verbal inspiration. (*Luth. Herold*, quoted in *Lehre und Wehre*, 1907, p. 468.) This question certainly was not “trotted out” in 1937. In 1909 the General Synod addressed this official declaration to the General Council: “Whereas the General Synod has ever occupied the same position with reference to the true and complete inspiration of the canonical Scriptures, therefore resolved that we herewith declare our adherence to the statement ‘The Bible is the Word of God’ and reject the error implied in the statement ‘The Bible contains the Word of God.’” (Neve, *History*, etc., p. 451 f.) So there was a controversy on these questions even within what is now the United Lutheran Church of America long before the present days. Surely some men in the Washington Ministerial Association know this. This is true, of course, that at the present day the controversy is reaching a climax. But who is to blame for that? In which Lutheran body are the men to be found who deny, contrary to the resolution of the General Council, verbal inspiration and defend, contrary to the resolution of the General Synod, the thesis that “the Bible is not, but only contains, the Word of God”? But let Dr. Dell speak on this point—and others.

The “Editorial Epilog” declares in the introductory paragraphs: “We desire unity among Lutherans but not unity at the expense of truth. If it comes to a choice between these two: (1) outward unity, with a hushing up and smoothing over of deep-going differences in our views regarding the reliability of the Bible, and (2) outward disunity, even controversy, with the result that this doctrine of inspiration is thrust into the foreground and thought about and debated,—if it comes to a choice between these two, I say, the second alternative is much to be preferred. For the former can never lead to a real unity but the latter may.”

Dr. Snyder's question “Can it be possible that, when many other seeming obstacles are being removed, some new one should be trotted out?” gets this answer: “Well, that is turning the tables on us in good style. We who ‘profess’ a desire for Lutheran unity have ‘injected’ the doctrine of inspiration and have thus ‘trotted out a new obstacle’ to unity. Surely, if the Washington pastors are desirous of showing that no difference exists, this is not a good way of going at it. It reminds me of a passage in the Old Testament. King Ahab had been harboring the priests of Baal, and

as a result drought and famine came upon the land. But when he met Elijah, the king said, 'Art thou he that troubleth Israel?'

"So now those who believe in verbal inspiration — and they are a large and respectable majority, as we have seen — are suddenly accused of troubling Israel by trotting out a new obstacle to Lutheran unity. They might well point out that verbal inspiration proved no obstacle to the formation of the American Lutheran Conference in 1930 and that, when the intersynodical committee of the Missouri Synod and the American Lutheran Church met in 1937—38, verbal inspiration was no obstacle at all. They might well point out that they did not trot out that one volume commentary on the New Testament. They might well say, 'We have not troubled Israel, but — somebody has.'"

The Washington pastors were told by Dr. Snyder that "the Lutheran Church, outside perhaps of the Missouri Synod, has never subscribed to a verbal theory of inspiration." Dr. Dell tells them: "In the May, 1935, *Pastor's Monthly* (A. L. Church) Professor Lang investigates this 'Missouri doctrine' and finds that it is also American Lutheran Church doctrine, also Norwegian Lutheran Church doctrine, also Augustana Synod doctrine, and even United Lutheran Church doctrine in at least a part of the U. L. C. A. Some of the authorities he quotes in that article are given here. Dr. R. C. H. Lenski (A. L. C.): 'Verbal inspiration, then, is simply that the divine act, moving, enlightening, controlling, and governing the holy writers, extended to the words which they used, so that only those words were chosen which God wanted for the conveyance of the thought. . . . If the thought is said to be inspired and not the words, we can never be certain even as to the thought; for it often turns on a single word and comes to us wholly in words.' *Dogmatic Notes*. Dr. Lenski is dead, but if you will turn back to Rev. Fricke's paper, you will see that what Dr. Lenski taught is still held in the A. L. C. . . . Dr. J. A. O. Stub (Norw. Luth. Ch.): 'Today almost the entire Lutheran Church of America holds to this belief' (verbal inspiration). 'The Synodical Conference in particular and the Norwegian Lutherans are here in accord. The Norwegian Synod has stood as an unwavering champion of this doctrine.' *Verbal Inspiration*, 1915. . . ." Four additional representative theologians are quoted.

Dr. G. E. Lenski thinks that the Washington Conference did better than the intersynodical committees with their headshakings and grumblings. What does Dr. Dell think of this? He writes: "It seems rather futile to say, as I have read elsewhere (*Lutheran Church Quarterly*), 'If this intersynodical committee cannot get together, let us appoint another that will'" (Rev. G. E. Lenski speaking). "Isn't that a rather naive viewpoint? As if all that is

required for unity on this basic doctrine is to keep on appointing committees until we find one that is indifferent enough to say, 'It doesn't matter'!

"The members of the intersynodical committee (U. L. C. and A. L. C.), whether members of theological faculties or not, were honestly chosen as men capable of representing the position of their respective churches. They found serious differences, in their opinion, in the views of the two bodies on inspiration. . . . Shall we now suppose that, because they were of the theological faculties, they did not know what the pastors and people of their groups really hold? Who should know better than theological faculties what the pastors, especially the younger ones, hold and teach? And if the theologians who find these differences in doctrine are mistaken, if behind the disagreeing theological faculties stand two church-bodies the rank and file of whom believe the same thing, then it seems to me it is time that one or the other set of theologians was repudiated by its church-body, which it is supposed to represent but does not."

The intersynodical committees honestly said they do not agree. At the Washington Conference the same opposing, contradictory teachings were presented—and we are told that the conference was convinced that no disunity exists. We do not know what to make of that. Dr. Dell says on this point: "When I study these two papers by the Washington pastors, I cannot help feeling that the members of the intersynodical committee were not mistaken; that there is a difference in the viewpoint of the two bodies that is deep and shocking. The difference comes out in these very papers which are supposed to bridge the gap. Compare, for instance, these two statements, the one by Dr. Snyder, the other by Rev. Fricke:

"Shall we quarrel over an adiaphoron while a sin-sick, needy world is hungering for the Bread of Life? (U. L. C.)

"If behind Inspiration is placed a question-mark, then all Christian doctrine is questionable. (A. L. C.)

"Would it be better to pretend that the difference is not there, to heal the skin over the wound, and leave the festering sore beneath? I do not think so. Better to keep the wound open until it heals from within, even if the process is painful for the time being."

Did Luther and the Confessions teach verbal inspiration? That has nothing to do with the case. We say they did. Others say they did not. We shall not start a doctrinal controversy on that point. But let those who find comfort in the fact that the Confessions, for instance, contain no separate article on Inspiration ponder the words of Dr. Dell: "The question did not come up in their day.

But it has come up in ours. It is now entirely too late to say, "They believed in inspiration, and we believe in inspiration; that is all that is necessary." No; unfortunately that is not all that is necessary now. Due to some regrettable teachings and publications it is now necessary to ask, What do you mean by inspiration? To what extent is the Sacred Record reliable? May one throw out portions of it and cast doubt on other portions at will?"

We wish we could have the whole of Dr. Dell's straightforward and forceful "Epilog" reprinted here. We do have enough space for the concluding paragraph: "I do believe, though, with the Washington pastors that there is a great deal more unity of belief on the subject of inspiration between the rank and file of United Lutheran Church pastors and people and the pastors and people of other American Lutheran bodies than would be suspected from certain semiofficial statements of the U. L. C. A. It is only with the purpose of strengthening that real unity and bringing it out into the open beyond all camouflage that these words are written."

TH. ENGELDER

Sermon Study on Col. 3:1-4

Eisenach Epistle Selection for Ascension Day

If ye, then, be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth, vv. 1, 2. "If ye, then, be risen with Christ." The if does not denote any uncertainty, but from the certain fact of their resurrection with Christ, chap. 2:12, their quickening together with Him, 2:13, Paul draws certain necessary inferences and conclusions. They have risen, συνηγέρθητε, have been raised with Christ. The aorist describes this act of God as definitely accomplished. When did this raising with Christ take place, and what is the nature of this quickening? The apostle had answered both questions in the preceding chapter. In Baptism they had been buried together with Christ, 2:12. On the mystic union with Christ effected in and by Baptism compare such passages as Rom. 6:3 ff.; Gal. 2:27. Faith, which is engendered through Baptism, unites the believers with Christ, makes them members of His body, participants of the fruits of His burial and resurrection. Therefore the apostle had at once added that in Christ, united with Him, they had risen with Him, συνηγέρθητε, were raised together with Him, "through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead," 2:12. (Note that Paul uses the same word, raised together, as in 3:1.) The same almighty power operating in the resur-

rection of Christ was operative also in the engendering of their faith, in their regeneration by means of Baptism. This spiritual resurrection was possible only because Christ had blotted out the handwriting which had been against them, taking it out of the way and nailing it to the cross, v.14. There on the cross Christ finished the fulfilment of the Law which He had begun at the moment of His conception, had carried out during a lifetime of perfect obedience to every iota and tittle of the Law, and finally and forever had accomplished when the last penny of the sinners' guilt had been paid by Him, when the bitter cup of vicarious sufferings had been drained to the dregs, when after His triumphant shout of victory "It is finished!" He had bowed His head and given up His ghost on Calvary's cross. On the basis of this vicarious atonement God had been reconciled, and having forgiven all their trespasses (cp. 2 Cor. 5:19, the objective justification of the world), He had quickened the Colossians together with Christ, had through faith appropriated to them all the blessings earned by Christ, had made them partakers of a new life, a life no longer of death in sin and the uncircumcision of the flesh, but a life in and with Christ, a life of freedom from the wrath of God. This is a life spent in the blessed knowledge that they are now the beloved sons of God in whom He is well pleased; a life in which they serve God in holiness and righteousness, knowing that all imperfections and shortcomings have been blotted out on the cross of Christ. It is a life in which they need not fear death because they are united with Him who is the Resurrection and the Life. That is the blessed life into which they were raised when in Baptism they were quickened together with Christ, 2:13; 3:1. Now, if that is true,—and, thank God, it is true,—then the inescapable conclusion, the unavoidable obligation for every Christian is, Seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. In order to realize the full significance of these words, we must understand what is meant by Christ's sitting on the right hand of God.

There can of course be no doubt that Scripture very frequently uses the term "right hand" to denote the physical right hand of man. Yet there are many passages where this meaning cannot be intended. Take, e. g., Ps. 89:25. The hand of the Messiah, the true David, was to be set, placed, in or on the sea and His right hand on the rivers. That certainly does not mean that Christ's human, physical hand was so large that it could be set up in the ocean and at the same time on the rivers. (Note the plural.) The psalmist is thinking of a physical hand and arm of the Messiah as little as in v. 42, where he complains that God has set up the arm of the adversaries of His Anointed. In both in-

stances he uses the word in a figurative sense, that of power, sovereignty, government, lordship. The very first time this term is used in connection with God leaves no doubt as to its meaning. We read Ex. 15:6: "Thy right hand, O Lord, is become glorious in power; Thy right hand, O Lord, hath dashed in pieces the enemy." The right hand is merely the symbol of the glorious power of the Lord; for it was not the physical hand of God that overthrew the enemy, but as Moses immediately continues, as though to forestall any possible misunderstanding: "And in the greatness of Thine excellency Thou hast overthrown them that rose up against Thee." And in chap. 14:24 it was not the hand but the look of the Lord that troubled the Egyptians. It was that Lord, like unto whom there is none among the gods, who alone is glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders, who stretched out His hand, and the earth swallowed them, 15:11, 12. He who is glorious in holiness, infinitely exalted above all His creatures, needs no physical hand, be it ever so strong, needs no physical arm, be it ever so powerful. He is not, like His creatures, dependent on physical eyes and ears and arms and hands. He is not hampered by a body, not limited by the laws of space or time. He is above all laws and limitations, the All-powerful, the Ever Eternal, the Ever Present One. For the New Testament usage of this term we need only refer to such expressions as the right hand of power, Mark 14:62; the right hand of the majesty on high, Heb. 1:3; the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in heaven, Heb. 8:1, and compare with this latter expression 1 Kings 8:27; Is. 66:1. See also 1 Pet. 3:22 and above all Eph. 1:20-22. There can be no doubt that in all these passages the Holy Spirit speaks not of a physical hand, but of the almighty, everlasting, unlimited power, majesty, and sovereignty of God.

At this right hand of God Christ *sitteth*, ἐστὶν καθήμενος, is a Sitting One. This construction reminds us of the word of the Lord spoken before the Council of the Jews: "Hereafter shall the Son of Man sit on the right hand of the power of God," Luke 22:69, where the same construction is used, be a Sitting One. The present participle denotes the continued state of sitting, while the absence of the article stresses the qualitative force of the participle. Henceforth it shall be, says Christ, and it is now, says Paul, the distinguishing characteristic of Christ, the Son of Man, that He is one sitting at the right hand of Power. This is as true today as it was 1900 years ago when Paul first penned these words, and that describes Him as He shall be world without end. Now what does this mean?

Sitting on the right hand of God cannot mean a sitting in silent meditation, in quiet self-contemplation, in restful inactivity.

Christ has not entered heaven as a hermit enters his cave for the purpose of secluding himself and disassociating himself from the world. The word καθήμενος is the translation of the Hebrew word יָשָׁב, translated in the English Bible sitting or dwelling, and quite a common attribute of God, the Sitting One. God does not sit in heaven in order to have a place where He may conveniently forget about the world and let the world run its course as it may. The selfsame God that is sitting or dwelling above the cherubim is addressed Ps. 80:2 ff.; 99:1 ff.; Is. 37:16-20; of Him we read 1 Kings 22:19-23. Surely God sitting in heaven is not an idle God. He is Life; He makes use of His power, His sovereignty, His majesty, in ruling and governing the world. In like manner the sitting of Christ at God's right hand denotes, not a state of inactivity, but His participation in God's government of the world. This is the clear doctrine of Holy Writ. We need only call attention to passages which define His sitting at the right hand as holding in subjection angels and authorities and powers, 1 Pet. 3:20; or as making His enemies His footstool, Ps. 110:1; or which describe His exaltation, of which His session is an integral part, as the rule over all the world, Phil. 2:9-11. We point particularly to Eph. 1:20-22, where His sitting at the right hand is defined as His government over all things and as His omnipotent rule and lordship over His Church.

This sitting of Christ at the right hand of God cannot denote a localized sitting in a definite, circumscribed place in heaven. We have seen that according to Scripture the right hand of God is not a physical place, so that one sitting at the right hand cannot at the same time be at the left hand of God. No; God's right hand is His majesty and power, unlimited by time or space. Localizing Christ in heaven is tantamount to localizing the right hand of God, localizing God's power, God's presence, God's being, in opposition to Ps. 139:7-10; Jer. 23:23, 24. Localizing Christ's sitting at the right hand of God is also in direct contradiction to God's clear Word. Eph. 1:23 we are told that the Church, which is Christ's body, is the fulness of Him that filleth *all in all*, heaven and earth, the entire universe. Moreover, Christ Himself tells His enemies: "Ye shall see the Son of Man sitting," as a Sitting One, "on the right hand of Power and coming," as a Coming One, "in the clouds of heaven," Mark 14:62. He, the Sitting One (present participle), is the Coming One (present participle); the Coming One is the Sitting One. Neither sitting nor coming is to be localized. So they shall see Him coming while sitting, sitting while coming. How is that possible? His body, we say, is no longer the body of humiliation but a glorified body, Phil. 3:21, fully, and uninterruptedly making use of the divine omnipresence given to His

human nature when the Son of God received it into union with His person.

What a glorious Jesus is our Jesus! The Christ, the Anointed One, anointed without measure, more than His fellows, Ps. 45, 7, sitting on the right hand of God! That suckling in Mary's lap, that infant whom pious Simeon took up in his arms, that babe who fled into Egypt to escape the murderous sword of an earthly monarch, is now sitting at the right hand of the Majesty on high, the omnipotent Ruler of the universe, the almighty Head of His Church, placing all His power and majesty at the disposal of His body, guiding and protecting it with His mighty hand against all enemies, watching with never-sleeping eye and shielding with omnipotent loving-kindness every individual believer. He it is who is not ashamed to call us His brethren, Heb. 2:11 ff.; Matt. 28:10; John 20:17.

If, then, you are raised with this Christ, *seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God.* Τὰ ἄνω, two small words, three syllables, five letters, yet they include all that heaven has to offer, all that Christ, the perfect Savior, in whom dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead bodily, has procured for mankind, all that He, sitting at the right hand of God, offers to His Christians as their almighty and gracious King. If these things are worth while, — and there is no Christian that will dare to deny that, — then there ought to be no need of any admonition to seek, to strive after, to endeavor to obtain and keep, them in one's possession. The apostle knew that Christians are not wholly spiritual, that there is ever present the Old Adam, their carnal nature, in which "dwelleth no good thing." Therefore he exhorts them, *Seek the things which are above, and continues, not merely repeating this admonition, but making it at the same time clearer and stronger: Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth.* Φρονεῖν is a stronger term than seek, stronger also than the translation in our Bible. It means to set not only one's affection but one's entire heart and soul on a matter, to let one's whole mind, every thought and desire and consideration, be occupied with, and directed toward, the things above, not toward things on the earth. The apostle himself enumerates a number of the matters pertaining to this earth, vv. 5-8. The Old Adam is only too willing to run with the world into the same excess of riot, 1 Pet. 4:4; yet the new man will always direct his mind and thoughts toward that Christlike conversation described in vv. 10-17. In the chapter preceding our text the apostle had warned against some of the more subtle forms of seeking and minding earthly things. He had cautioned his readers against will worship, ἐθελοθρησκία, 2:23, a self-willed worship, a form of service chosen by man's own will. An example of such self-chosen service is the

observance of certain days as a divinely commanded act, the abstaining from certain meats and drinks, 2:16, which forms of worship were at best shadows of things to come, earthly types, v. 17, rendered unnecessary since the body, the heavenly antitype, Christ, has come. Such a self-chosen worship is the voluntary humility, 2:18, 23, that sham meekness, which only too frequently is coupled with vain, puffed-up haughtiness, manifesting itself as soon as one contradicts their ability to penetrate into those things which they have not seen, on which Scripture is silent, which they claim to know to perfection; cp. 2:19. We think, *e.g.*, of millennialists of almost every type, of Christian Scientists, theosophists, etc. Such self-willed service is false asceticism, neglect of the body and its needs and requirements, vv. 21, 23, practised by so many self-styled saints. The world may regard such self-chosen worship as wisdom supreme, as true holiness. It may appeal to the natural religious feeling of man. Yet all such worship, like all service of sin, is of the earth, earthly, incompatible with the things above. Therefore a Christian will not be deceived and beguiled of his reward by their vain claims, 2:8, 18. He will not fall victim to their allurements, will not set his heart and mind on these things of the earth, but will direct his thoughts upward, heavenward, to the things above, where Christ sits at the right hand of God.

Seeking justification, occupying his mind with the salvation of his soul, — and a Christian knows of no matter more important, — a Christian will not look to earthly matters for salvation, to a righteousness of his own making. He will not trust in his own virtue, nor rely on his own character. He seeks salvation not on this earth but sets his heart and mind on things above, on that righteousness which Christ above has earned for Him; that garment of fine linen, clean and white, which the Lamb gives to all His followers, against which all other garments are as filthy rags; that righteousness which alone is accepted as perfect by God, since it is a righteousness which His own Son has purchased by His obedience and death.

Seeking sanctification of life, deliberating on ways and means to serve His God and Savior, again a Christian does not mind earthly things. He looks for information not to the sages of the world; he does not ask his own reason, does not work out a scheme of his own, to worship and serve the Most High. He relies not on his own strength to do the will of God. Nor is he discouraged because of the weakness of his own flesh and blood or because of the power and fierceness of the enemies opposing him. All that is of the earth, while his heart and mind is set on that which is above. He lifts up his eyes unto the eternal hills whence cometh his help. There, in heaven, sits Christ, his Savior, on the

right hand of God, Jesus, the Author and Finisher of his salvation, his Righteousness and Sanctification. Humbly he confesses: Rom. 7:18; yet more than conqueror through Christ that loved him, he defies all his enemies and exclaims: 1 Cor. 12:9 b; Phil. 4:13.

The Christian will find joy and satisfaction in the beauty of nature, in God-pleasing arts and sciences, in the happiness of family life, of friendship and Christian fellowship. He will faithfully perform the duties of his earthly calling and profession. Yet he remembers that, after all, these pleasures and duties pertain to the things of this earth, and he will never permit them to fill his heart and mind to the exclusion, the neglect, the slighting, of that heaven-born joy, that peace divine, which the redeemed soul has found in Christ Jesus, its heavenly Bridegroom. In Him the Christian is complete. For in Christ dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead bodily, Col. 2, 9. Having Christ, can we ask for more? In Him the Christian finds the full satisfaction of every spiritual want. Seek Him! Set your affection, your whole heart and mind and soul, on Him alone! Is it not to be deplored that Christians are still in need of such an admonition? Alas for the weakness of our faith and life! Alas for the strength of the Old Adam in us, who constantly drags us down from the realms on high, from heavenly joy and peace and life, from the throne of God and Christ, into the dust and dirt of this earth, into its vanities, its sins, its self-righteousness, into the pride of flesh and the lust of eyes and the love of the world, which passeth away! *Sursum corda!* Set your heart and mind on things above!

That is not impossible, even if at times it seems a hopeless undertaking. To encourage his Christians, to strengthen them for their struggle against those matters mundane which would fill their heart, the apostle adds another reason for heavenly-mindedness.

For ye are dead, ἀπεθάνετε; for ye have died. Their resurrection with Christ (v. 1; cp. 2:12, 13) implied that they died with Christ. "Death annuls all obligations, breaks all ties, cancels all old scores." (*Expositor's Greek Testament* on Rom. 6:7.) Christ, as the apostle states, Rom. 6:10, died unto sin once, ἐφάραξ, once for all. While He lived, sin lay upon Him; He was burdened by its guilt, which was imputed to Him by His Father; He suffered the penalties of sin; He was craftily tempted by Satan. This relation to sin, which He had of His own free will assumed from the moment of His conception, ceased with death. He had died unto sin, had no longer any relation to sin. Its guilt was done away with, its penalties fully paid; its power to attack Him in futile efforts to seduce Him was at an end. Together with this Christ, the believers, one with Him in faith, have died unto sin when they united with Him in Baptism. Sin has lost its right to accuse them,

its authority to condemn them, its power to rule over them. They are freed from sin, Rom. 6:7, freed from its jurisdiction by the judicial sentence of the Supreme Judge. Their old sinful life and the things of this earth can influence them as little as all the riches and pomp and pleasures of this world can influence a man dead and buried. He is blind, deaf, dumb, dead, to all its lures and attractions. Of course, the apostle is speaking here of the Christian as a new-born, spiritual man, of his new nature. It is this new man, which constitutes him a Christian, to which he owes whatever spiritual power he possesses.

Paul does not carry out the thought of death to sin and things of the earth but hurries on to tell his readers more about the glorious life which was engendered in them when they became Christians. He had already told them that their life was intimately bound up with the life of the risen Christ. In Christ their spiritual life has its source and well-spring; from Him they daily draw new life and strength. Now he tells them that their life is *hidden*, the perfect denoting that the state of being hidden still continues. The apostle uses not βίος, the mode or manner of life, but ζωή, life as existence, as to its true nature. The manner of life, its manifestation, is not hidden, and should not remain hidden, Matt. 5:16; 1 Pet. 2:12. But its real nature, its well-spring, is hidden. We see the water gushing forth from the rock and hear it murmuring, babbling, as it flows over its stony bed; yet its origin is hidden deep, deep in the rock, invisible to human eye. We see the trees bud, the shrubs put forth their leaves, the flowers burst into glorious bloom. We can tell the difference between a dead plant and a living one; yet the life itself, which is so evident in its effects, is invisible, hidden, a deep mystery. That is true of the physical life of man, of his mental life, and especially of the spiritual life of twice-born men. What is that faith that makes a Christian so different in actions, words, thoughts, desires, from an unbeliever? Just what kind of power is it that enables a Christian to exclaim with Paul: Rom. 8:28-39; Gal. 6:14; Phil. 3:7 ff.; 4:12, 13? To natural man that seems folly and foolishness, superstition, hypocrisy, weak-mindedness, bigotry, *odium humani generis*, etc. And even to the believing child of God it is a mystery, hidden to his understanding, even though he feels the heart-throbs of this life within himself and is aware of the indwelling in him of the Triune God and His Spirit, Rom. 8:26 ff.

As long as we live in this world, our life as children of God is hidden *with Christ in God*. Christ, who as our Savior came upon this earth a true man, visible to his fellow-men, has now ascended on high, has removed His visible presence from man. He is now in God, the Omnipresent One. In this omnipresent, yet invisible

God, Christ now is, has His being. His life is in God, hidden, mysterious, invisible. We see His guiding hand in the history of the world, of the Church, of our own lives, and still His life, what is it? Where is it? What is its nature? What is the secret of its power? We cannot tell, human mind, mortal reason, cannot lift that veil behind which Christ's life in God is hidden. It is a life of a true human being, a spiritual life of perfect righteousness and absolute holiness. It is a life in God, entirely, essentially, intimately, united with God, completely absorbed in God and in things divine, a life that finds its bliss, its sole happiness, its life, in God.

With this Christ our life is hidden in God. Christians live in Christ. Though sitting at the right hand of God, He is not removed from His Christians, He is still united with them, dwells in their hearts. Their lives are part of His life, His life their life, Gal. 2:20. His life shall be in His believing followers a well of water, the sources and hidden springs of which are in Christ, in God, and which already here in this world bubbles forth into a living stream of good works and finally flows into everlasting life. This hidden life coming down from the throne of God brings a bit of heaven into this sinful earth. Christian homes, Christian communities, breathe indeed a spirit of Paradise, are vestibules of the mansions above. How much more like peaceful, happy Eden would this earth be if more homes, more communities, would give evidence of that life outlined by the apostle in his exhortation to manifest Christian heavenly-mindedness, chap. 3:10 to 4:6!

The aorist ἀπεθάνετε had called the attention of Paul's readers to "the accomplished act of dying" (Meyer), the perfect νέκυνται to "the continuous subsisting relation in reference to the present up to the *parousia*." (Meyer). Now he directs their hearts and minds to this future revelation of their hidden life.

When Christ, who is our Life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory. Note the absence of any connectives. *Repentina luce percipit*, says Bengel. The abruptness of speech startles by its sudden unexpected light. When, ὅταν, at the time that Christ appears, who is our Life (John 14:11; 6:33, 48-58), with whom our life is now hidden in God; at the time that He fulfils His promise (John 14:4; Acts 1:11), then, τότε, at that precise moment, shall ye also appear in glory. Ye, every individual Christian is addressed. Not only will the Church as a body appear in glory, so that our individual existence shall have ceased; no; ye, every single Christian, young or old, man or woman, shall then be manifested in glory. That Christ who is Resurrection and Life, with whom the Christian already in this life has been quickened, with whom every individual believer has been united in that

strange mystic union, that Christ will manifest Himself as Life, as the Life of His Christians, as our Life, by raising our mortal body, by reuniting the soul with the body, by glorifying us with the likeness of His own glorified body, 1 Cor. 15; John 17. Then it will become manifest to all—to us, to our fellow-saints, to the world—that our life already in this earth was life indeed, that our Christian assurance of spiritual and eternal life, based on the promise of our Savior, was not an idle fancy, not a man-made theory, doomed finally to die and be buried in that vast graveyard of theories discarded and hopes blasted. On that blessed day our life shall appear in its true nature, life in the fullest sense of the word, a life which is beyond the possibility of our present conception, a life in which we shall participate with Christ, our Life, in that heavenly life into which He entered when He ascended on High to sit on the right hand of God.

Our text with its wealth of thoughts suitable for sermons on Ascension Day again proves the mastery of the compilers of the Eisenach series in choosing passages appropriate to the occasion. It directs hearts and minds upward to the ascended Christ. After presenting the story of the ascension in the introduction, the preacher may choose for his theme, *Ascension Thoughts for Ascension Day*. Let us direct our minds and hearts to Christ's ascension, to our daily ascension (cp. Hymn 233:5; 236:2), to our final ascension.—*The Ascended Christ is All in All*. With Him we have died unto sin. With Him we are living in a heavenly life. With Him we shall appear in glory.—Though Christ has withdrawn His visible presence, He is with us and will be with us forever. *Manifestations of the Ascended Christ*. In the lives of His Christians. In the appearance on that Day.—Though in many respects there seems to be no difference between the lives of Christians and unbelievers, there is an essential difference. The unbeliever's life is of the earth, earthly. *The Christian's Life a Life in Christ*. 1) In Christ it has its hidden well-spring. 2) In Christ the Christian's life on earth becomes a heavenly life. 3) In Christ his life shall be manifested in glory.—*Seek Those Things that Are Above!* There is Christ, your Savior. There is the fountain of your strength. There you shall be forever with Christ.—The ascended Christ charged His Church, Matt. 28:19, 20; Acts 1:9. What has our Church done during the past century? What are we doing? *Why do So Many Christians Take So Little Interest in Spreading the Kingdom of Christ?* Because we forget our enduring obligation to our King, our ever present strength in Christ, our future glory with Christ.

TH. LAETSCH

Miscellanea

What do You Think of This?

It appeared in the *Lutheran Companion* of February 24:

"To the Editor: — I do not like the designation 'interne'; therefore I hope that some one will discover a better title for the students sent out by our seminary as assistants. Why not 'pastor's assistant,' which would conform to 'graduate assistants' in our colleges and universities, or simply 'parish-worker'?"

"Here is a new proposition: Not only the advanced seminary students but also the seminary professors ought to be sent out to serve congregations at intervals. Let a professor serve a year in some congregation each year, i.e., so that one professor is away each year. If we have six seminary professors, each professor would be doing congregational work every sixth year. After having taught five years, he needs to be away from his books a year. And by doing so, he would keep up with the ever-changing work in our congregations and be better qualified as a teacher of those who are to go out in the field as ministers.

"For the same reasons every pastor should keep on studying, in order not to 'get rusty,' by attending some seminary or university either during the school-year or taking some summer courses during his vacation. Just as the teacher in a seminary needs to keep up with the practical work in the congregation, — which can be done only by doing such work, — so the pastor needs to keep up with what is being done in the field of education by attending institutions of higher learning.

"We feel that our Church in particular and the kingdom of God in general would be better served, the more qualified our pastors and professors become. The demands upon the Gospel minister have never been more exacting than today, and the burdens placed upon his shoulders have never been so heavy as they are today.

"All education, knowledge, and experience, sanctified by the Holy Spirit, are blessings to the Church.

"Pittsburgh, Pa.

CRITICUS VETUS"

What about sending out the professors to serve congregations at intervals? No professor would object to serve a year as assistant — full-time assistant — to a pastor. But there are objections of a different kind. However, we do subscribe fully to the statement that "our Church would be better served, the more qualified our professors become." Surely — and every one of us is working toward that end. E.

Practise Courses in the Seminary

Discussing this subject, Dr. W. P. Ladd, the dean of the Berkeley Divinity School, writes in the *Living Church* of February 9: "The generalizations of the report of the Joint Commission to Consider the Present Facilities for Theological Education in the Church submitted to the General Convention at Cincinnati, will be interesting but not convincing to those who prefer their conclusions to rest upon a factual basis. . . . If it

is further true, as they say, that 'something is wrong with the work of our seminaries' and that they are 'maladjusted to the present day,' that also is a disquieting fact, and one that should be a matter of concern to the Church at large. The seminaries themselves would undoubtedly rejoice to be shown by intelligent critics how they are maladjusted and would welcome any help the Church or the commission could give to discover and remedy what the commission calls 'the defects in our present system of theological education.'

"What the commission members chiefly have in mind is the importance of practical training for the work of the ministry. And on this point, stated in these general terms, there ought to be complete unanimity of opinion. . . . But there is bound to be difference of opinion as to how this practical training is to be given. . . . When they say, 'Something is wrong with the work of our seminaries,' and, 'The seminaries seem maladjusted to the present day,' they mean that the seminaries are not giving the practical training which the commission wants them to give. They do not argue their case but they enforce their criticism by quotations. For example: 'No man should be able to graduate from a seminary without knowing how to deal with a troubled person or a tangled family situation, and do it intelligently.' And this: Young graduates 'know next to nothing about how to minister to the sick or dying, how to comfort the sorrowful, how to organize, how to deal with vestries, even how to make parish calls.'

"Doubtless seminaries and their faculties can effectively accomplish a certain amount of practical training. They can and do prescribe courses in preaching, etc. When it comes to such matters as ministering to the sick and dying, they can provide a limited amount of good advice. . . .

"Furthermore, we learn practical things by practising. There is no other way. And for the practise of the theological student the seminaries are simply not in a position to furnish the sick and dying, the sorrowful, the troubled person, the tangled family situation, vestries, even parishioners to be called on, as *corpora vilia* for courses in pastoral theology. And another question presents itself. Where are the seminaries to find time in their already overcrowded curriculum for these additional practical courses? Obviously it must be by the sacrifice of the theological courses they are now teaching. Then we shall have theological education with a minimum of theology or perhaps without any theology at all. That this is the logic of the report is clear from the fact that, though the commission undertakes to discuss 'the present facilities for theological education in the Church,' they have nothing to say of the study of theology. It comes out clearly, too, in the following statement, which they quote with obvious approval: 'The scientific method is not the method of finding truth by logical deductions from assured premises; it is the method of finding truth by observing life in action. The scientific way to learn the meaning of a truth such as gravitation, for example, is not by analyzing the idea of gravitation, but by watching how bodies behave while under the influence of gravitation. And the scientific way of learning the meaning of Christian truth is not primarily by philosophic analysis of theological concepts but by watch-

ing how persons are affected and how they behave when under the influence of this Christian truth. We are not persuaded that our theological seminaries have adopted this scientific method.' Newton, it seems, made a great mistake in spending so much time on mathematics. He should rather have sat under the trees watching apples fall until he grasped the meaning of the truth of gravitation. . . .

"It is reported that medical schools, law schools, and engineering schools are under constant pressure from their alumni and the general public to cut out scientific courses and teach their students the practical tricks of the trade, and it is not strange that a similar attitude toward theological schools should be wide-spread in the Church. The commission is undoubtedly taking a popular line. . . .

"The logic of all this is that theological seminaries should continue to teach theology, should do it more zealously than ever, and should in this undertaking have the Church's whole-hearted support. It is unfortunate that the commission could not have said something like that. . . . A scholarly, comprehensive, modern course in the traditional theology of the Christian Church will be the indispensable minimum, while the training in prayer and Christian living which inheres in three years of seminary discipline tests their vocation and lays the foundation for a consecrated ministry. If out of this seminary training has come some measure of the supreme virtue, humility, they should be able after graduation to adapt themselves to their new parochial responsibilities without too great damage to the parish."

So far Dr. Ladd. — Just *how much* practise work should be required at the seminaries? In solving that question, do not, in the first place, take too much away from the theoretical study. There is not much that can be dispensed with. And, in the second place, do not *minimize* the ability and willingness of the *normal* graduate to put his learning to practise. The normal graduate is not a helpless creature. Rev. J. Fletcher, Director of the Graduate School of Applied Religion, Cincinnati, writes in the *Living Church* of February 23: "Some of us who are concerned with the problems of pastoral training can heartily endorse the joint commission's plea for more practical and clinical study and at the same time agree with Dean Ladd's feeling that 'theological seminaries should continue to teach theology,' etc. . . . Here at the graduate school and its summer session we hold a compromise, believing that the soundest *clinical* course comes as *internship* after the basic academic preparation. The seminaries do indeed have an 'already overcrowded curriculum.' Then let the courses of applied theology come after the seminary. In the three-year seminary period an attempt to curtail the 'knowledge' and expand the 'practise' risks doing neither well." E.

If We Would Hold What We Have

Among the many great and difficult problems of our Church is that of the Sunday-school. Much as the fact is deplored in large circles, the fact remains that for the majority of the children in our congregations the Sunday-school is the chief, and often the only, agency for the indoctrination of children till they enter the catechumen classes. But the Sunday-school, even at its best, is able to devote only about one-fifth as

much time to the teaching of its pupils as the parish-school. It stands to reason therefore that the Sunday-school should offer the best possible teaching in an intensive course, which will provide at least a minimum of indoctrination.

The problem is connected, at least in part, with housing facilities, equipment, text-books, and methods of teaching. But most closely connected with these factors, and in most cases overshadowing them, is the matter of teachers who are actually trained to take care of their work. This involves not only willingness and consecration on their part; it calls specifically for intensive and systematic education of all those who desire the privilege of teaching in our Sunday-schools. All these facts have been presented at various times in our church literature and seem to be generally acknowledged.

In order to help the congregations of our Synod to meet the problem of the Sunday-school, a special committee on teacher-training was appointed somewhat more than two years ago. This committee not only held regular sessions to deliberate on the many difficulties connected with this problem but sponsored a *seminar* for the study of the entire question, with a view to preparing text-books and other teaching helps for pastors and Sunday-school officers and teachers. The work has now reached maturity, and the first results of the committee's efforts are appearing on the market at this time.

The plan includes eight text-books, with their instructors' guides and tests, on the first level, or for the preliminary training of Sunday-school teachers. The first book, on organization and administration, entitled *Working Together*, is now ready, and the prospectus has been sent to all pastors. Two further volumes, namely, one on Bible doctrines and one on Old Testament history, will be ready by the time this notice reaches our readers. The remaining booklets of the series deal with the art of teaching, church history and missions, New Testament history, and music and Christian art. For information not contained in the prospectus write to the Sunday-school Office, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

P. E. K.

Brief Information on the Summer Session and the Pastors' Institute,

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo., June 27 to July 9

I. General Information

1. According to the resolution of Synod (*Proceedings* of 1935, p. 44) the school is under the direction of the faculty and the Board of Control of the Seminary, the buildings and equipment of the school being utilized exactly as during the regular school-year. This means that also the full library equipment and similar facilities of the Seminary are at the disposal of all students of the Summer Session, and the usual arrangements regarding interlibrary loans are in force during the summer term.

2. The control of the Summer-school is vested in a special Summer-school Board, of which the president of the institution and the dean are members *ex officio*. There is also a special director of the Summer Session. Registration, publicity, all clerical work and records, etc., are

administered by the office of the dean. The director of the Summer Session, together with the Summer-school Board of the faculty, is in charge of all matters pertaining to instruction.

3. The purpose of the Summer Session is to serve all such pastors as desire to increase their theological knowledge in order to remain in contact with the developments in the field of theology and with the primary movements in the Church at large. The level of the work is chiefly postgraduate, and all such pastors as desire systematic and accredited work will be offered progressive courses in all the fields of learning represented in the Seminary. Such professional training as will better equip a Lutheran pastor for the successful execution of the work of his office will be offered in every department of the Summer Session.

4. The course of the Summer Session will carry the following fees: Cost of board will be \$5 a week. If lodging is not required and only the noonday meal is taken at the Seminary, the cost will be 40 cents a meal. Registration and library fees are \$1 for the term of attendance. The fee for the Pastors' Institute is \$1 a week. The fee for students and attendants in the Summer-school will be \$2 a course in addition to the registration and the library fee. For late registration, *after June 1*, which is the dead-line, an additional dollar will be charged.

II. Administration of the Course of Study

1. While the Summer Session is intended primarily for graduates of our own seminaries, applications of graduates from other seminaries will also receive consideration. All students have the same privileges with reference to the equipment at the Seminary.

2. Unclassified students or such as have not yet reached the graduate level may be enrolled for courses for which the committee in charge believes them eligible.

3. A special feature of the Summer Session will be the Pastors' Institute, which will run parallel with the regular classes of the Summer-school, thus giving all students of the regular courses an opportunity to attend the special lectures of the Institute.

4. Students who desire to work without credit but are interested in any particular course or courses may enroll as visitors. The writing of papers and final examinations is optional for such students; but the fees are the same as for regular students.

III. Organization of the Work of the School

a. The work of the school in the Summer Session is so organized as to offer progressive courses leading to certificates and to the degrees of B. D. and S. T. M. A credit represents eighteen hours in the classroom, and in the session of 1938 one and a half credits will be given for each course for which a student is enrolled. This means that courses given at the rate of two hours a day will total twenty-four hours during the coming Summer Session. Additional credits may be obtained by enrolment in the Extension Division or the Correspondence Courses of the Seminary.

b. Credits for Degrees in the Summer Session and Extension Division of Concordia Seminary.

1. *Evaluation of Credits.* (Correspondence work chiefly, the B. D. degree being terminal in this work.)

One credit is given for approved work, one hour in the classroom per day during a full session of the Summer-school, with all required papers and tests. One credit is given for every *ten* reports in the Correspondence Division, averaging 1,000 words each and equivalent to three hours of study. One course may be completed in approximately 60 reports of 1,000 words each.

2. *For B. D. Degree.* (Combination of Correspondence work and work in session.)

The equivalent of 30 credits on the first level is required for the Bachelor of Divinity degree. Of these, eight credits must ordinarily be earned in session. A thesis of at least 10,000 words is included in the requirements for the degree.

3. *For S. T. M. Degree.*

The equivalent of 20 credits beyond the B. D. level is required for this degree. Of these, eight credits must be earned in session, preferably in the candidate's major field of work. A greater degree of initiative and ability to analyze and arrange material is expected on this level. The emphasis is on the quality of the work rather than the quantity alone. A dissertation of at least 15,000 words on an approved subject is included in the requirements.

The S. T. D. degree is given only in the postgraduate department.

IV. Time of Conducting School and the Teaching Staff

1. The Summer Session is conducted immediately after the close of the sessions of Synod and is to continue for two weeks of six days each, that is, from June 27 to July 9, inclusive.

2. The teaching staff is selected from the regular faculty of the Seminary, augmented by representative men from other institutions of a similar rank as well as capable clergymen. The faculty in 1938 will include Prof. Theo. Engelder, D. D.; Prof. E. J. Friedrich; Prof. L. Fuerbringer, D. D.; Prof. Theo. Hoyer; Prof. O. P. Kretzmann; Prof. F. E. Mayer; Prof. J. T. Mueller, Th. D.; Dr. F. Pfotenhauer.

V. Lectures and Courses Offered in 1938

1. The Institute Lectures.

The Preexilic Minor Prophets. (Fuerbringer.)

The Church and the Changing Social Order. (O. P. Kretzmann.)

Present-day Problems of the Lutheran Pastor. (F. Pfotenhauer.)

Liturgical Problems of the Present Day. (Fuerbringer.)

2. The Summer-School Courses.

B-402. Pastoral Problems According to First Corinthians. (Mueller.)

B-505. Authority in Religion. (Engelder.)

B-506. Religious Thought in America, from the Revolution to the World War. (F. E. Mayer.)

B-613. Beginning of the Reformation in England. (Hoyer.)

B-702. Problems in Sermon-making. (Friedrich.)

3. A feature of the Summer Session will be the morning and evening devotions, which will be conducted as follows:

First Week, 9:30 A. M. Pastor Hobart Meyer

First Week, 8:00 P. M. Pastor Paul Koenig

Second Week, 9:30 A. M. Dr. H. B. Hemmeter

Second Week, 8:00 P. M. Dr. H. B. Hemmeter

Description of Courses Offered in 1938

- B-402. Pastoral Problems According to First Corinthians.
 B-505. A Discussion of the Problem of Authority in Revelation.
 B-506. A Study of Religious Thought and of the Accompanying Religious Movements from about 1770 to the Present Time.
 B-702. A Discussion of the Main Factors and Problems in Constructing and Delivering a Sermon.
 B-613. Beginning of the Reformation in England.

NOTE. — These courses will be given as warranted by the registration and enrolment: a minimum of eight students per course. It is assumed that all men who are enrolled in the Summer-school will also register for the Pastors' Institute.

VI. Schedule for Pastors' Institute and Summer-School *

June 27 to July 9, 1938

Period	First Week, June 27 to July 2	Second Week, July 4—9
7:35-8:25	B-702 EJF B-506 FEM	B-402 JTM B-506 FEM
8:35-9:25	INSTITUTE LECTURE LF	INSTITUTE LECTURE FP
9:30-9:55	MORNING DEVOTION	MORNING DEVOTION
10:00-10:50	B-402 JTM B-505 TE	B-702 EJF B-505 TE
11:00-11:50	INSTITUTE LECTURE	INSTITUTE LECTURE
1:00-1:50	(7:35 A. M. courses)	(7:35 A. M. courses)
2:00-2:50	(10:00 A. M. courses) B-402 JTM B-613 TH	(10:00 A. M. courses) B-402 JTM B-613 TH
7:00-8:00	OPEN FORUM	OPEN FORUM
8:00-8:30	EVENING DEVOTION	EVENING DEVOTION

One credit for every eighteen hours in the classroom.

One and one half credits for each course during the session 1938.

* Slight adjustments may become necessary; but the program will not be modified essentially.

P. E. K.

Theological Observer — *Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches*

I. Amerika

May Lutherans Reject the Verbal Inspiration and the Authority of the Scriptures? Some time after the *New Testament Commentary*, issued under the general editorship of Dr. Alleman of Gettysburg in 1936, appeared, Dr. Reu, in the *Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, wrote a withering review of this work, calling attention to the Modernism which vitiates it in large sections. Among the things Dr. Reu criticized were positions taken by Dr. William C. Berkemeyer, who furnished the section dealing with the pastoral epistles of Paul. This commentator had expressed the view that the pastoral epistles were probably not written by Paul, but by a later writer, a view which, together with other matters, Dr. Reu severely castigated. Defending himself, Dr. Berkemeyer writes an extended rejoinder in the *Lutheran Church Quarterly* of January, 1938. He gives his article the heading "A Lutheran Right and Duty: a Reply to Dr. Reu." Having stated he felt that in honesty he would have to give to his readers the views of modern critical opinion on the authorship of the pastoral epistles, he continues:

"But Luther's principle 'Does this writing preach Christ?' has a deeper significance, even on its formal side, than the mere application to the question of authorship. It suggests that within the acknowledged writings of a man we must ask: 'Is Paul or John or Peter speaking here with the characteristic touch of his real genius, or is he but reflecting and passing on ideas which belong to the thought-world of his day or perhaps giving practical directions which have a temporary but not a permanent value?' Asking this question, I ventured to play the Paul of Gal. 3:28 against the Paul (if it should be Paul) of 1 Tim. 2:9-15. I felt I had a right to point out this conflict and even to take sides in the matter. Surely all we want — all the world can expect from a man, even an inspired man of God — is that prophetic insight by which he shows himself to have a word from God for us. The rest of the man and his thought we can afford to let go. At any rate, we must not regard him as infallible because he is inspired. That would be to deny and ignore his obvious human limitations and make of him a creature of a wholly different order. The facts of history will not permit such a conclusion. The writers of Scripture were not angels, but men. Nowhere is there a better illustration of the need and value of this application of Luther's principle than in considering Luther's own writings. There is both wheat and chaff in Luther, both inspiration and limitation, and woe to him who cannot or will not distinguish.

"Now, Luther's principle has still another aspect, the most significant of all. As a material principle it demands that we judge Scripture by Christ. But the Scriptures are themselves the great source of knowledge of the historical Jesus. This means that a man must not only judge the Scriptures by the Gospel of Christ; he must first of all determine from Scripture what the Gospel really is. On that matter Christendom has never been in perfect agreement. Luther's conception of the Gospel was

neither Calvin's nor Rome's. We follow in Luther's tradition. But being conscious of that tradition is something different from being fettered by it. Face to face with the Scriptures the Christian of today, and especially one who would comment upon the New Testament, must keep asking the question: 'What is the Gospel?' For even of the New Testament it must be said as it was of earlier Jewish writings: 'The Gospel is there, the whole Gospel, but how much more!' When we wrote concerning the place of women in the Church that we need not accept the conclusions of the writer of the pastorals or the literal implications of the passage in Gen. 3:16 as binding upon us, we were giving expression to a value-judgment based on a particular conception of the Gospel which we believe to be both Paul's and Luther's. We believe we can and must do this. If our Christianity is to remain a spiritual religion, we must be allowed to keep asking and answering the question: 'What is the Gospel?' True, only men of the spiritual stature of Paul and Luther can give us a clear and simple answer to the question because the Gospel is the Gospel of God and of Jesus Christ. Men must approach the wisdom and goodness of God Himself to understand and interpret His will to us. But we must keep the way open for men of this caliber to arise and speak to us. The fact that we have a written record of God's revelation does not make this unnecessary. Spirit and life cannot be contained or preserved or handed down in words — only in lives. For us, as for Luther, not the writings of Scripture but the living word of the Gospel is the means of grace.

'Right here, in the matter of the authority of the Scriptures, lies the chief difference between the viewpoint of some of the men who wrote the *New Testament Commentary* and Dr. Reu. He himself has recognized this in his review. For us the authority of the Bible is a spiritual authority, not only that it pertains to spiritual matters alone, but also that it is an authority which can be applied and felt only in a spiritual fashion. The Scriptures maintain their authority for us because of the truth they reveal. That truth is the Gospel of Christ. But the Gospel is itself a spiritual reality which can be recognized and felt as binding on men only through personal, moral, and spiritual experience. The Holy Spirit within a man, and the Spirit alone, can convince him of the meaning of the Gospel, of its validity, and of its spiritually authoritative character.

'The Scriptures are for us like a garden in which God has planted many trees, and in the midst the tree of life, of the knowledge of good and evil, of the power to do the good and reject the evil. That tree is Christ Himself. Of the fruit of this tree we must taste in order that we may be able to distinguish among the other plants of the garden. Only so can we differentiate between fruit- and shade-trees, evergreens and flowering shrubs. It may happen that others, first entering the garden, will be found to be eating leaves for fruit, using fruit-trees for shade, mistaking a berry-bush for an apple-tree, admiring beautiful blossoms instead of tasting of the fruit of the tree of life. We must be concerned for them. They, like ourselves, may have been directed to this garden by a sign-board outside which others who had enjoyed its

fruits had placed there. But we have come to recognize the divine nature of the garden by the fruit we have tasted, not by the sign-board. We must teach others to recognize divine truth in the same way. Otherwise there is no future for Christianity as a spiritual religion."

One is amazed not only at Dr. Berkemeyer's repudiation of the inerrancy of the Scriptures but at his reasoning and his failure to apprehend the meaning of certain passages in Paul's writings. That Gal. 3:28 and 1 Tim. 2:9-15 are not in disagreement ought to have been evident to him. If anything is clear, it is that Paul in the former passage is not speaking of social or official rank and privileges but solely of a person's status in the sight of God. When Paul, for instance, there says that in Christ there is neither bond nor free, he certainly does not mean to contend for the abolition of slavery, as can be convincingly shown from other passages in his writings. One notes with surprise that Dr. Berkemeyer seems to think that those who teach the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures and insist on their infallibility hold that the holy penmen were infallible in everything they said and did apart from the writing of the Scriptures. Again, when he appeals to the case of Luther to illustrate what he means by inspiration, one is startled to see a Lutheran theologian place the Reformer on a level with the apostles and prophets.

What the author says about Luther's "material" principle, asserting that it demands that we judge Scripture by Christ, rests on a thorough misunderstanding of the words of Luther which he has in mind. For Luther it was one of the great facts of religious truth that the Holy Scriptures portray Christ to us. He would have considered Dr. Berkemeyer's position very strange indeed, because it puts Christ and the Scriptures into different categories. For Luther they were simply inseparable. He had his doubts, it is true, whether certain books of the sixty-six which constitute our Bible belong to the Holy Scriptures, but he did not doubt that whatever is Scripture preaches Christ. Furthermore, are we in danger of being fettered if we follow Luther in his conception of the Gospel? Yes, if the Gospel is something fluid which changes with the coming and the going of the various generations, but not if the Gospel is eternal truth, given once for all by our gracious heavenly Father and relating to us the greatest fact of history, the redemption of Jesus Christ. Certainly every person must ask himself the question, What is the Gospel? But what folly to say that this universal obligation makes of the Gospel something subjective, a variable quantity. "Spirit and life cannot be contained or preserved or handed down in words—only in lives," says Dr. Berkemeyer. And still his next sentence is, "For us, as for Luther, not the writings of Scripture but the living word of the Gospel is the means of grace." "The living word of the Gospel"—is it written, or is it something we meet only in human lives? We must confess that we are perplexed. We cannot follow the author. We fail to see consistency in his presentation.

Finally, when Dr. Berkemeyer says that for him "the authority of the Bible is a spiritual authority, not only that it pertains to spiritual matters alone, but also that it is an authority which can be applied and felt only in spiritual fashion," the implication seems to be that, when the

Bible speaks of things which are not spiritual, its authority ceases. If we understand him, he wishes to express the view that in matters of external fact (history, zoology, etc.) the Bible cannot be regarded as inerrant. But does he not see that the Gospel, whose authority he wishes to uphold, is largely a record of external facts, of the birth of Jesus, His deeds of mercy, His suffering and death, and His resurrection? The Christian religion, it has been correctly said, is a religion of great historical facts. That the true interpretation of these facts can be given by the Spirit of God alone and that it is the Spirit Himself who must make us willing to accept this interpretation, we readily admit. But if a person professing Christianity denies that the Bible reports facts correctly, he not only paves the way for the introduction of stark subjectivism and uncontrollable emotionalism into his religion as its determining element, but he is helping to destroy the very basis of Christianity itself.

A.

This Sounds Familiar. — Discussing the Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine (Church of England), the *Living Church* of March 9, 1938, says: "The interpretation which the Commission has attached to the inspiration of Scripture may be, and doubtless is, a commonplace of present-day thinking, but certainly it is not yet a commonplace of doctrinal statement. In this field Anglican doctrine has not been restated since the days of the Reformation, when scientific Bible research was unheard of, when Higher Criticism was undreamed of except by solitary prophetic souls of the following of Rabbi Ben Ezra, and when Charles Darwin and his Genesis-upsetting account of origins were by several centuries still unborn. Even at that date the Church of England, owing to 'the tendency common to Anglican and Orthodox thought to distrust rationalizing theology,' was saved from stereotyping theories of inspiration then prevalent into the quite unscriptural dogma of the inerrancy of the Bible; and when in due time Darwin was born, wrote the *Origin of Species*, and died, happier than Galileo or Bruno in his lot, he was buried in Westminster Abbey. The dogma of the inerrancy of Scripture, ineptly termed Fundamentalism, received a mortal blow in Edinburgh last summer in the report on the Word of God which was adopted, *nemine contradicente*, by the Second World Conference on Faith and Order. Scholars engaged in scientific Bible research read in its recognition of the legitimacy of their work and its insistence that the freedom for carrying out their work be not denied to them the Magna Carta of their liberties. In the report of the Anglican Commission so-called Fundamentalism receives its *coup de grace*. Not by implication, as in Edinburgh, but explicitly and in forceful terms the Commission states its conviction that 'the tradition of the inerrancy of the Bible cannot be maintained in the light of the knowledge now at our disposal'; that 'the authority must not be interpreted as prejudging conclusions of historical, critical, and scientific investigation in any field'; and that 'stages of Biblical revelation are to be judged in relation to its historical climax,' the standard being 'the mind of Christ as unfolded in the experience of the Church and appropriated by the individual Christian through His Spirit. . . . The effect of this section of the report is unpredictable.

In the nature of the case the Roman Church, which is doctrinally immobilized by its dogma of the inerrancy of Scripture, will reject it, as will several small Protestant denominations, which in this respect concur with Rome. In the larger Protestant denominations it may lead the way for similar official or semiofficial restatements of the doctrine of Biblical inspiration. As for its influence upon Orthodox thought, it would appear to the writer that the new intellectual life now stirring in Orthodoxy, the ancient heritage of freedom which it is now recovering, and above all its 'pneumatological' as distinguished from legalistic character are good auguries for a sympathetic reception of the report as a whole. . . . As 'the method of direct appeal to isolated texts' is so evidently liable to error, it is to be expected that preaching from isolated texts will gradually give place to genuine expository preaching in which the Word of God *contained* [italics in original] in the Scriptures will be sought, studied in all the light that modern scholarship affords, and then applied to problems of the modern world."

All of this sounds familiar. Spokesmen for certain sections of the Lutheran Church in America have been using the identical language of the Anglican Commission's report. We can assure the Commission that the liberal section of the United Lutheran Church is ready to adopt its report. It is a commonplace of doctrine there. All or nearly all the statements of the report and of the *Living Church* article can be matched by similar or identical statements there current. The phrase "Word of God *contained* in the Scriptures" is familiar to United Lutherans. Also the term "immobilized." United Lutheran publications speak of "canned theology." When the Anglican Commission speaks of "the mind of Christ" and the "Word of God contained in the Scriptures" as being the standard and final authority, the liberals among the United Lutherans will say: That is a commonplace among us; and all these years we have been protesting against the proof-text method.

One statement made in the article is not a commonplace. It was news to us, too. It is the statement that the "tendency to distrust rationalizing theology" saved the Church in the Reformation days from "the unscriptural dogma of the inerrancy of the Bible." The doctrine of the verbal inspiration and the inerrancy of the Bible is due to rationalistic thinking? We were always told that the *denial* of these doctrines is one of the chief achievements of the age of rationalism. E.

The National Lutheran Council Extends Its Work.—Several Lutheran papers report that the National Lutheran Council is endeavoring to bring about cooperation between the Lutheran bodies represented in it in the field of Inner Missions. The *Lutheran Companion* of February 24 writes: "Cooperation on a vast scale among the Lutheran bodies of America is in the making. One of the most significant moves in this direction was taken at the recent meeting of the National Lutheran Council in Detroit, Michigan. . . . Heretofore the principal efforts toward Lutheran coordination have been in the province of Home Missions. This time it is in the field of Inner Missions. According to the plan adopted, a new agency of the National Lutheran Council, to be known

as the Department of National Lutheran Welfare, will be charged with the task of carrying out the details of the cooperative venture. Eight general Lutheran bodies will participate in the new movement. They are: the United Lutheran Church in America, the Norwegian Lutheran Church, the Augustana Synod, the Icelandic Synod, the American Lutheran Church, the Danish Lutheran Church, the Lutheran Free Church, and the United Danish Lutheran Church. In other words, all Lutheran bodies in America except those belonging to the Synodical Conference (Missouri Synod) will cooperate. More than three hundred agencies and institutions now controlled or operated by these bodies will be affected by the plan. These embrace Inner Mission societies, orphans' homes, home-finding agencies, day nurseries, homes for the aged, deaconess homes, hospitals, hospices, seamen's missions, industrial missions, rescue homes, and settlement houses. It will not be the purpose of the new department to own or to operate any particular institution or agencies but to confine its work for the present to coordinating and stimulating Inner Mission work and determine standards and policies. The executive committee of the National Lutheran Council has been charged with the responsibility of working out the proposal. It will also select a man to direct the activities of the department. It is planned to create State or regional associations similar to the national organization, but concerned primarily with local affairs. The advantages of the proposed set-up are obvious. Not only will it help to eliminate considerable duplication of effort and waste of money and man-power, but it should result in much greater efficiency. With the constant raising of standards by State and secular social agencies it becomes increasingly necessary that the Lutheran Church conduct its Inner Mission activity on a plane that reflects credit upon the Church. The new arrangement will prove valuable in obtaining adequate recognition of Lutheran welfare work from Government bodies and community-chest agencies. Heretofore such recognition has to a great extent been denied because of the competition of various Lutheran groups and because there was no central organization to represent Lutheran interests."

The *Lutheran Companion* then speaks of the value of such cooperation in times of particular stress and difficulty. "The Department of National Lutheran Welfare will also be in a position to direct Lutheran relief work in all times of emergency. In this respect the Lutheran Church gained much from its experience during the World War. It was out of the National Lutheran Commission for Soldiers' and Sailors' Welfare that the National Lutheran Council was born. The depression years have also taught the Church the value of cooperation in the administration of relief in the large centers of population."

The Synodical Conference, as the report states, is not represented in this move. The reasons are well known. Our aloofness is not due to failure to see the value of cooperation or to lack of sympathy with those who are suffering and need our help, but rather to the desire to be found faithful to the Word of our great God, who has told us that "to obey is better than sacrifice."

A.

Dr. Brunner Invited to Join the Princeton Seminary Faculty.—

Most of the readers of this journal are aware that Prof. Emil Brunner of Zurich, Switzerland, is one of the foremost Barthians of today. He has been elected to the Charles Hodge Chair of Systematic Theology in Princeton. It is his intention to come to Princeton as a guest professor for the year 1938—39, in the course of which he will determine "whether he can become adjusted to academic conditions in a new country." The *Presbyterian* prints an "intimate" letter of Dr. Brunner stating his doctrinal position:

"I would feel perfectly free in my conscience to accept your call so far as my theological convictions are concerned. I do not only firmly believe in the godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ according to the teaching of the apostles, especially according to Paul and John, and in the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures according to the commentaries which Princeton Seminary has placed in my hands, but it is more than ever my earnest desire to devote the remaining lifetime which God may grant me to the interpretation, defense, and preaching of this Scripture teaching as the only hope of our poor world. I know that certain questions were raised by you as to my attitude towards the historical facts and the trustworthiness of the gospels. These questions were, if I understand rightly, based on certain remarks in my *Philosophy of Religion*. Now, unfortunately, the translator of this book did not mention the fact that this book was written in 1925, that is, in the beginning of my theological 'revolution,' if I may call it so, and therefore shows many traces of a stage of an evolution which is characterized by a constant and steady concentration towards the sacred history and the teaching of the Bible. My only ambition is to become more and more a Bible theologian and to know nothing but Jesus Christ crucified. If there is a certain difference between Karl Barth and myself, it is this, that I find in his theology certain tenets which are not in accordance with Scripture, e.g., his indifference towards the historical facts as such and the lack of fulness in his witness to the life-renewing power of the Holy Spirit. It is, however, my conviction that faith in the inspiration of the Bible does not exclude, but include, the distinction between the Word of God and the earthly, temporal vessel which carries it.

"As to the Reformed or Presbyterian type of doctrine, I feel thoroughly at home just in this conception of the Gospel truth, and I believe myself to be more true to this tradition than my friend Barth, whose merit, however, in bringing theology back to this line, I heartily acknowledge. There are certain elements of the traditional doctrine which I do not consider as an adequate expression of the New Testament teaching, but I hold that these are minor points, and I am ready to correct my views any time wherever I see that the authority of the Bible stands against them."

It is plain that Professor Brunner is "Reformed" in his theology and that he refuses to accept the whole Bible as the inspired, infallible Word of God. The *Presbyterian* adds that he is forty-eight years of age and has a perfect command of English for purposes of speech and writing.

A.

A Dubious Venture.—At the coming General Assembly we shall probably be asked to consider a proposal for "visible unity" which comes to us from the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. If we approve this proposal, we shall stand committed to a "purpose to achieve organic union." The theological statement incorporated in the declaration of the Episcopal Church is very brief. It is sound in what it says of Jesus Christ and of the Sacraments. It mentions only one other doctrine, that of the Scriptures; and its wording in this respect is unfortunately vague. It reads: "recognizing the Holy Scriptures as the supreme rule of faith." That is all. Here, under this misty phrase, is room for the Modernist as well as the evangelical. We must confess that it comes far short of satisfying us. We are much troubled also by the fact that the Church of England, parent and closer partner of our American Episcopal Church, has just received a report on religious doctrine which is undoubtedly heretical. The report hedges on the question of Scripture, declares that the historical evidence for the Virgin Birth is "inconclusive," is vague about evolution, miracles, angels, the bodily resurrection of Christ, and even the future life. It suggests the possibility of a union under "a Papacy which renounced some of its present claims." This report has aroused tremendous opposition from the conservative wing of the Church of England. We are concerned to know the attitude towards it of the Protestant Episcopal Church of this country. Light upon this question would go far to enlighten us as to our attitude when we come to the General Assembly. Many other questions besides the doctrinal one are involved in any discussion of her union with a liturgical, episcopal Church; but the doctrinal question is infinitely the most important.

The Presbyterian, Feb. 17, 1938

Brief Items.—With respect to the World Council of Churches which is to be organized at a meeting in Holland in May, the Church of England proceeds with proverbial British caution. Its Church Assembly resolved to participate, but it declared emphatically that it will not assume any responsibility for action taken till it has had an opportunity of examining and approving the respective measures.

Youth is enthusiastic and willing to strike out along new paths. When recently a retreat was held at Union Seminary, New York, participated in by professors, students, and visiting ministers, and a certain group deliberated on the ministry in rural communities, the pastors in the meeting, so a report says, "were concerned with chiefly how to keep the rural church alive, the students with how to relate the church to rural social problems." Apart from the psychological reason pointed to, the attitude of the students may have been due to their not having received the training in Bible doctrine which in former decades was dispensed even in seminaries with radical tendencies.

That Dean Israel H. Noe, an Episcopalian clergyman of Memphis, Tenn., who endeavored to prove immortality by fasting and making his body free of material needs, has been deposed by his bishop, the press has widely reported. We are told in the *Living Church* that the chapter

of the cathedral concurred in the action of the bishop. After a stay in the hospital the former dean seems to be in good health again.

According to a photograph published in the *Presbyterian*, together with pertinent information, the Princeton Seminary faculty numbers sixteen full-time professors.

On February 12 Norway lost a prominent theologian, Bishop Johan Peter Lunde of Oslo. He was born in 1866. It was in 1922 that he was appointed bishop of Oslo. We are told in the *National Lutheran Council Bulletin* that he was the author of many religious books and pamphlets and that his children's sermons are widely used in all Lutheran countries.

In January, Savannah, Ga., saw a big Methodist meeting, held in honor of the Wesleys. It will be remembered that John and Charles Wesley were active in Georgia before the so-called Aldersgate experience of John Wesley, when he, attending a meeting of Moravians in London, heard the preface of Luther to the Epistle to the Romans read and was brought to a fuller understanding of the work of Christ.

In Canada, we are told, a commission is at work endeavoring to perform a task similar to that of the commission of Anglican bishops which issued the much-discussed "Statement of Faith." We are wondering whether the report of the Canada commission will show the same modernistic complexion as that of the British bishops. It is to be noted that the Canada commission represents the United Church of Canada (Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Methodists) and not Episcopalians.

From New York it is reported that the mayor of the city, Mr. La Guardia, will take the leadership in a campaign to raise one million dollars in order to finish the interior of the cathedral of St. John the Divine (Episcopal) before the opening of the World's Fair in 1939.

In Vancouver, B. C., the Roman Catholic archbishop complained of the injustice inflicted on Roman Catholics who have to support the public schools and in addition maintain parochial schools for their own children. His plea, it seems, was not heeded. We are told that in the Yukon territory Roman Catholic schools are supported by public funds, the country being very sparsely settled. Undoubtedly the archbishop wished to see the same system introduced in Vancouver.

Brooklyn used to be known as the "city of churches." We are told that one prominent churchman now calls it "the city of too many churches." To prove his view correct, he states that, while in 1921 the expenditures for benevolences by all the churches were \$837,000, in 1936 they amounted to only \$365,000.

In Mexico the Catholic boycott of public schools has ceased, we are told. It seems that better relations between Church and State have been established. The Mexican government is said to show great zeal in opening new schools and in improving the educational system. The report on which we draw says that in the three years in which President Cardenas has been at the head of the country five thousand rural schools, having an enrolment of 325,000 children, have been opened.

A.

II. Ausland

Luthertum und Humanismus. Angesichts der weiten Verbreitung des neuerwachten Humanismus in unserer Zeit dürfte uns eine Beurteilung desselben von Luthers Standpunkt aus interessieren, die Pfarrer O. Dilschneider in Jena in der „A. E. Z.“ (Nr. 8, 71. Jahrgang) unter der Überschrift „Theologie und Weltanschauung“ bringt. Pfarrer Dilschneider beginnt mit dem richtigen und wichtigen Gedanken, daß die „theologische Generation von heute in eine Auseinandersetzung von umfassendster Tragweite hineingestellt ist“. So auch in eine Auseinandersetzung mit dem Humanismus! Der Humanismus in genere läßt sich, wie der Schreiber darlegt, in den wissenschaftlichen, den philosophisch-ästhetischen und den politischen Humanismus einteilen. Für den wissenschaftlichen Humanismus zeigte Luther ein großes, bleibendes Interesse. Anders aber verhielt er sich dem philosophisch-ästhetischen Humanismus gegenüber. Hier forderte der Humanismus eine „Neugeburt aus Menschengeist“, während doch Luther, auf der Schrift stehend, nur eine „Neugeburt aus Gottes Geist“ anerkennen wollte. Hier fand Luther die menschliche Vernunft im Kampf gegen Gottes Wort, und darum kämpfte er auch so heftig gegen den rationalistischen Humanismus. Dilschneider schreibt hierüber: „Weder Freundschaft und Aufgeschlossenheit noch Abgrenzung und Zurückhaltung, sondern schärfste Gegnerschaft kennzeichnen seine Haltung gegen den humanistischen Geist seiner Zeit. Wie Luther hier dem Humanismus seiner Zeit den schärfsten Kampf ansagte, so haben auch wir uns im Luthertum darauf zu besinnen, wollen wir die Probleme und Lebensfragen, die uns heute auferlegt sind, nicht von Grund auf verfehlen. Wir müssen hier einmal in aller Offenheit bereit sein, tatsächlich auf das zu hören, was Luther dem Geist seiner Zeit, dem Humanismus, zu sagen hatte.“ Der Schreiber zitiert dann eine Reihe von Aussprüchen, worin Luther gegen Aristoteles und „Frau Hulde, die natürliche Vernunft“, die des Teufels „Hure“ ist, ja die „Erzhure“ und „Teufelsbraut“, so scharf zu Felde zieht, und fährt dann fort: „Alle unsere Aussagen und Erkenntnisse fußen auf einer Autorität. Die Autorität aber im Humanismus ist der Mensch selber, seine höchste Einsicht, die er von den Dingen hat, seine Vernunft. Sie ist der Eckpfeiler der humanistischen Lebenshaltung und Lebensausrichtung. Das hatte Luther gesehen, und darum zieht er gegen sie zu Feld.“ Hier zitiert er dann die wichtigen Sätze aus Luthers großem Werk „Vom unfreien Willen“ (1525) mit der Warnung: „Wir wissen, daß die Vernunft nur törichte und widersinnige Dinge schwächt, besonders dann, wenn sie in heiligen Dingen ihre Weisheit zu zeigen anhebt“; und aus Luthers letzter Predigt über Röm. 12, 8 (1546): „Darum siehe, daß du die Vernunft im Zaum hältst und folgst nicht ihren schönen Gedanken; wirf ihr einen Dreck ins Angesicht, auf daß sie häßlich werde.“ Er schließt den ersten Aufsatz mit dem Paragraphen: „Für Luther standen Theologie und Zeitgeist in einem sich ausschließenden Verhältnis zueinander. Wohl arbeitete er mit dem Rüstzeug, das ihm der Humanismus seiner Zeit an die Hand gab. In seinen Händen finden wir die griechischen und hebräischen Texte und Grammatiken der großen Humanisten seiner Zeit; aber in seinem Herzen lebt Christus, und sein Arbeiten und Denken ist allein vom Wort der Schrift getragen und erfüllt. Gerade durch diese Haltung vermochte uns Luther das Vermächtnis einer echten, biblischen Theologie zu hinterlassen.“

Wir bringen diesen Artikel in kurzen Gedanken hier wieder, nicht nur weil er an sich wichtig für uns ist, sondern uns auch einmal wieder daran erinnert, wie sehr man jetzt in Deutschland in ernstere Kreise Luther studiert. Aber das erinnert uns auch mit Schmerzen daran, wie sehr man in unsern lutherischen Kreisen in Amerika heutzutage Luther vernachlässigt. Wenigstens findet sich weder in unsern Zeitschriften noch in den aus andern lutherischen Kreisen viel aus und über Luther. Luthers Theologie schlummert hierzulande, und wir laufen Gefahr, daß wir uns in einen „orthodoxen“ Schlummer hineintwiegen lassen, der schließlich sehr verderblich für uns werden muß. „Neugeburt aus Menschengestalt“, das „Fußen auf Vernunft“, daß man die Vernunft den „Ecksteiner der Lebenshaltung und Lebensausrichtung“ sein läßt, daß die Vernunft auch hierzulande „ihre Weisheit in heiligen Dingen zeigen“ möchte, kurz, daß auch wir in Gefahr stehen, auf unsere Vernunft und nicht allein auf die Schrift zu hören, das alles muß uns doch sehr ernstlich bewegen, zur Schrift, zum lutherischen Bekenntnis und zu Luther zurückzukehren mit einem wahren Eifer im Suchen nach den Gottesgedanken in seinem Wort und im Niederdrücken der eigenen Vernunftgedanken. Unser Walthers war doch eigentlich nur Lutherus redivivus. Auch wir müssen als Schrifttheologen wahre Lutheri rediviui sein, wollen wir das lutherische Zion in unserm Lande recht bauen. J. L. W.

Das Bekenntnis beim Quatenus. Auf D. Saffes seinen Bekenntnisartikel hin „Warum müssen wir an der lutherischen Abendmahlslehre festhalten?“ veröffentlicht in der „N. E. L. A.“ [Nr. 7; 71. Jahrgang], lief in derselben Zeitschrift später eine scharfe Kritik von Seiten eines deutschen Pfarrers ein, worin die quatenus-Unterschrift der lutherischen Abendmahlslehre gegen Saffes quia-Forderung Verteidigung findet. Der Schreiber argumentiert etwa so: Um dieses quatenus willen konnte ich [lutherischer] Pfarrer werden; auf der Seite dieses quatenus kann ich Pfarrer bleiben. Ich habe es mir erlaubt, meine Ordination als Ordination auf den Christus, die Wahrheit, zu verstehen. Wenn mich nicht das feste Vertrauen durch meine Ordination geleitet hätte, meine Kirche wolle und könne mich zu nichts andern, Größerem, Weiterem oder Wahrerem verpflichten, als den Christus, die Wahrheit, zu suchen und festzuhalten als Lernender und Lehrender, dann wäre ich vor der Ordination aus dem Amt geschieden. Eine so verstandene Ordination gibt einem, wenn entschieden sein soll zwischen dem quia und dem quatenus, keinen Weg frei als den des quatenus. Das bleibt mein Weg den Bekenntnisschriften gegenüber und auch der Bibel gegenüber. Denn wenn der Weg zum Christus führt als letztem Ziel, dann gilt auch vor der Bibel noch ein quatenus. Gälte mein quatenus nur im Blick auf die Bekenntnisschriften, so wäre für mich z. B. das natus ex virgine immer noch durch ein Bibelwort gesichert. Nun aber gilt mir das quatenus auch der Bibel gegenüber. So stehe ich zu Bekenntnisschriften und Bibel.

In seiner Antwort auf diesen liberalistischen Heuchelpfarrer, der mit seinem „Christus“ nicht den Christus der Schrift, sondern einen „gemachten“ und falschen Vernunftchristus will, der daher auch weder lutherisch noch christlich ist, macht Sasse sehr freundlich und milde auf die Not der Gemeinde aufmerksam, indem er schreibt: „Der evangelische Pfarrstand muß, einfach aus christlicher Liebe, wenn er es sonst nicht versteht, um der armen Gemeinden willen, denen er zu dienen hat, die Last und, wenn es sein muß, die Not einer ganz eignen Lehrverpflichtung wieder auf sich nehmen. Wenn

er es tut, dann wird er erfahren, daß er selbst den größten Segen davon hat. Denn nur die ganz ernste und ernst genommene Lehrverpflichtung macht den Pfarrer zum *minister Verbi divini*, zum „Diener des göttlichen Wortes.“ Weiter: „Ich kann auf die Augustana nur ordinieren, weil ich nach ernstestem Studium der Schrift davon überzeugt bin, daß jene die richtige Auslegung des Evangeliums ist. Nur das *quia* begründet eine wirkliche Bekenntnisverpflichtung; das *quatenus* ist in Wirklichkeit nur eine höfliche und milde Form der Auflösung des Lehrbekenntnisses.“ Weiter: „Die das Bekenntnis auflösende und damit die Kirche aufhebende Wirkung des *quatenus* wird an der Folgerung klar, die Pfarrer H. ganz richtig zieht. Man kann für die Ehrlichkeit, mit der das geschieht, nur aufrichtig dankbar sein. Er sieht ganz klar, was andere nicht sehen wollen, daß das *quatenus* dem Bekenntnis gegenüber mit Notwendigkeit ein *quatenus* der Schrift gegenüber zur Folge hat. Mit der *norma normata* des Bekenntnisses stürzt notwendig auch die *norma normans* der Heiligen Schrift. Wer es nicht glauben will, der studiere die Auflösung der Schriftautorität in all den modernen Kirchen, die die Bekenntnisse der Reformation und der alten Kirche außer Kraft gesetzt haben. Was wird dann aber die *norma normans* an Stelle der Schrift? „Christus“, lautet die Antwort. Aber wer ist „der Christus“, der „durch die Bibel“ zu suchen ist? Wir kennen nur den Christus, der in der Bibel zu finden ist, weil er dort, und dort allein, redet. Wer ist der Richter, der mit im Zweifelsfalle sagt, wo Christus und wo nur die Schrift redet? Habe ich dann nicht meine Vernunft, zu der ja auch mein religiös-sittliches Empfinden gehört, nicht zur *norma normans* erhoben? . . . Jene Verleugnung [der Jungfrauengeburt unsers Heilandes] bedeutet schließlich Verzicht auf den Schriftbeweis in der Dogmatik. Sie bedeutet damit auch das Ende der Reformation.“ Gerade das ist es, wozu die *quatenus*-Verpflichtung hinführt — zum Ende der Reformation, ja zum Ende des Christentums. Das *quatenus* zum Bekenntnis und zur Schrift bedeutet schließlich nur das, was man hierzulande Modernismus nennt.

D. Sasse schließt seinen Artikel mit den Worten: „Nichts anderes als die Sorge um die Erhaltung des Evangeliums und der Kirche des Evangeliums in Deutschland, soweit diese Sorge dem geistlichen Amt von Gott als Pflicht auferlegt ist, bewegt uns in unserm Kampf um das lutherische Bekenntnis. Möge diese Sorge auch dort verstanden werden, wo man die wirkliche Lage unserer Kirche heute noch nicht versteht, ehe es zu spät ist!“ Nicht nur die involvierte Lehrfrage selbst ist für uns wichtig, nämlich damit wir nicht in unserer Stellung zum Bekenntnis gleichgültig werden, sondern auch die Sachlage, wie sie durch die deutschen Volkskirchen geschaffen worden ist. Was von einem Bekenntniskristentum übrigbleibt, wo ein Staatskirchentum die Zügel in der Hand hat und wo noch dazu Unglaube neben Glauben, Laxheit neben Bekenntniseifer geduldet wird, das erkennt man auch sehr klar daraus, wie es heutzutage drüben in kirchlichen Kreisen steht. Die Lösung des Problems bleibt nur die freie, vom Staat unabhängige Gemeinde, und zwar eine solche, die dem Bekenntnis und der Schrift gegenüber eine *quia*-Lehrverpflichtung fordert. Welch erleuchtete Augen hatten doch unsere Väter, als sie im Jahre 1847 unsere Synode gründeten, und wie gut sind wir durch ihre fromme Wahl gefährdet! Daran wollen wir in diesem Jubeljahr ganz besonders auch als *ministerium Verbi divini* denken.

J. L. M.

Book Review — Literatur

Das Zwölfprophetenbuch. Von Alfred Jepsen. Gustav Schöhlmanns Verlagsbuchhandlung (Gustav Fied), Leipzig und Hamburg. 200 Seiten $5\frac{1}{4} \times 8$. Preis: Kartoniert, RM. 3.20; gebunden, RM. 4.20.

Ausgewählte Psalmen. Übersetzt und ausgelegt von Jakob Kröler. Derselbe Verlag. 158 Seiten $5\frac{1}{4} \times 8$. Preis: Kartoniert, RM. 2.80; gebunden, RM. 3.70.

Dies sind zwei weitere Bände in der Serie „Bibelhilfe für die Gemeinde“, und es gilt von ihnen etwa dasselbe, was wir schon von den andern Auslegungen dieser Serie gesagt haben. Die Übersetzung ist unsers Erachtens das Wichtigste an dem ganzen Werk, und das gilt sonderlich von dem ersten Buch. Vielen der Ausführungen können wir leider nicht beistimmen, wie der zweifelhaften Beschreibung des Wunders in 2 Kön. 18, 19 (S. 14), dem Hinweis auf einen *zweiten* Sacharja (S. 17), der Vermutung, daß das Danklied Zona 2, 3—10 eine spätere Einfügung sei (S. 109; vgl. S. 199). Im übrigen ist die Auslegung ziemlich annehmbar. Dies gilt in noch höherem Maß von dem Kommentar Krölers. Aber auch hier haben wir auszuweisen, daß der Verfasser manchmal Ansichten zu Papier bringt, die sicherlich nicht auf objektiven Tatsachen und nüchternem Studium beruhen, wie wenn er sagt, daß der Hinweis auf Ps. 2 in Apost. 4, 25 auf „einer falschen Überlieferung“ beruhe (S. 7), wenn er Ps. 40 nicht ohne Rückhalt als messianisch behandelt, wenn er Ps. 110 durchaus mit einer geschichtlichen Begebenheit in Davids Leben verbinden will, anstatt ihn einfach als eine Weissagung auf den Messias zu behandeln. Aber der aufmerksame Leser wird diese Stellen bald ausmerzen können und dann um so mehr Gewinn von den guten Teilen der Darlegung haben.

P. E. KREGMANN

The Parables of the Gospels and Their Meaning for Today. By Hugh Martin. The Abbingdon Press, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 251 pages, $5 \times 7\frac{1}{2}$. Price, \$2.00. May be ordered through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

This discussion of the parables of our Lord my readers will find useful. In simple fashion the author, a Baptist minister trained in Scotland and now living in England, a former assistant secretary of the Student Christian Movement, considers first the general subject of parables and their interpretation and then the individual parables. His object, as he says (p. 31), is to give a popular expository treatment of the parables. Their text is printed at the beginning of the chapters in which they are interpreted; the version there employed is that of Moffatt, while in general the Authorized Version is used by the author. In speaking of the exposition of parables, it is urged that the context, the central theme, and the teller of the parable be borne in mind—considerations which are extremely important. To quote but one sentence of a number of apt ones: “A parable has in it one truth and not necessarily every truth” (p. 27). I regret to see that the author does not rise to the heights of full appreciation of the Scriptures, acknowledging them as the inerrant Word of God (cf. p. 35).

W. ARNDT

Das Neue Testament Deutsch. Neues Göttinger Bibelwerk. In Verbindung mit andern Gelehrten herausgegeben von Paul Althaus und Johannes Behm. 2. Teilbändchen: Das Evangelium nach Matthäus, übersezt und erklärt von Julius Schniewind. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen. 1937. 274 Seiten 6×9. Preis: Fürs Ausland RM. 7.20; bei Subskription RM. 6.

Gern bringen wir das Erscheinen auch dieses Bandes in dem in vieler Hinsicht trefflichen Göttinger Kommentar, der den Namen trägt „Das Neue Testament Deutsch“, zur Anzeige. Wie unsern Lesern in Erinnerung sein wird, haben wir an den schon erschienenen Bänden, die mit dem jetzigen das ganze Neue Testament umfassen, die Übersetzung gelobt, die kernig und wohlklingend ist, sodann die bei aller Knappheit doch hochgradige Vollständigkeit der erläuternden Bemerkungen. Dieser Band reiht sich seinen Vorgängern würdig an und zeigt dieselben Vorzüge.

Mit Genugtuung sieht man, daß der Verfasser nicht bloß erklären will, sondern daß es ihm darum zu tun ist, die großen Wahrheiten, die das Evangelium enthält, dem Leser nahezubringen. Als Beispiel können wir eine Bemerkung zu Matth. 1, 23 (die Weissagung vom Immanuel) anführen: „Wie es von Jesu Erdenleben gesagt wird, daß Gott beständig mit ihm war (Apost. 10, 38; Joh. 8, 29), so ist er selbst in Person die Gegenwart Gottes für uns Menschen; s. 2 Kor. 4, 6; Kol. 2, 9; Hebr. 1, 3; Joh. 14, 6. 9; Matth. 11, 4 f. (s. d.). Wiederum hat uns Luther diese neutestamentliche Erkenntnis vermittelt: „Fragest du, wer er ist? Er heißt Jesus Christ, der Herr Jehaoth.“

In der Einleitung wird angenommen, daß eine besondere Quelle (Q) vorhanden war, worauf ein Teil unsers Evangeliums zurückzuführen ist. Doch wird zugegeben, daß die ganze Hypothese Q betreffend wackelig ist, und es wird bezweifelt, daß Q ein einheitliches, abgeschlossenes Buch war. Während der Verfasser durchaus konservativ sein will, sieht man doch mit Behmut, daß er, wie die meisten zeitgenössischen prominenten Theologen, sich nicht zur frohen Gewissheit emporschwingen kann, daß die Heilige Schrift Gottes unfehlbares Wort ist, und daß er, der Vernunft zuliebe, annimmt, hier und da würden uns in diesem Evangelium Legenden überliefert (s. besonders S. 266). Sollten nicht die Vorgänge in Welt und Kirche eine ernste Mahnung sein an alle rationalisierenden Theologen, zurückzulehren zu dem majestätischen „Es steht geschrieben“?

W. A r n d t

The Divine Inspiration of the Bible. By Arthur W. Pink. Published by Bible Truth Depot, Swengel, Pa. Printed by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 90 pages, 5×7½. Price: Paper, 65 cts.; cloth, \$1.00.

We have only one objection to this book, namely, that the author, in the chapter on „The Typical Significance of the Scriptures Declares Their Divine Authorship,“ goes into the realm of speculation. The fact that an earnest Bible student sees certain interesting parallels between Old Testament and New Testament sections does not yet prove the inspiration, except when the Bible itself declares such a parallelism to exist. But apart from this one criticism we recommend this book very highly, for the author, in a fearless and convincing manner, presents evidence for the perennial freshness of the Bible, for the unmistakable honesty of the writers, for the sublime character of its teaching, for the

fulfilled prophecies of the Bible, for the wonderful unity of the Bible, for the marvelous influence of the Bible, for the miraculous power of the Bible, for its completeness, for its indestructibility, and for the inward confirmation of the veracity of the Scriptures. He has one entire chapter on "Verbal Inspiration," which alone is worth the price of the book. What the author says in the Introduction has been borne out in countless instances: "Grant that the Bible is a divine revelation and communication of God's own mind and will to men, and you have a fixed starting-point from which advance can be made into the domain of truth. Grant that the Bible is (in its original manuscripts) inerrant and infallible, and you reach the place where study of its contents is both practicable and profitable."

P. E. KRETZMANN

Recoveries in Religion. By Ralph W. Sockman, D. D. Cokesbury Press, Nashville, Tenn. 284 pages, 5½×8½. Price, \$2.00.

Dr. Sockman sees the need of recovery in religion, as far as a liberal theologian can see it. And we, too, need to emphasize much of what he says. He hails "the repudiation of recent Liberalism." "The older Liberalism is regarded as too shallow." "The paths of progress are blocked by tired Liberals." "It is a matter of record that those religious groups which stress their extreme individual liberty are making little headway today" (p. 32). "Science stands repudiated as redeemer" (p. 212). While he believes in the social gospel, he utters the warning: "The crisis which our Protestant Christianity is facing today arises out of the fact that Christianity is shifting its center of gravity from the inner life to the social community (*The Christian Century*)" (p. 95). He does not quite agree with the writer who said: "The church is not attended today because it has nothing to offer which cannot be found in better form elsewhere" (p. 225). At the same time he castigates the preachers "who run their parishes quite as if there were no Holy Spirit" (p. 217), who "seek to attract hearers by announcing what the church has to offer, such as good music, cheering fellowship, interesting sermons" (p. 263), who, "to catch the public ear, draw on every best seller, fearing to stake their sermons on the Book of books" (p. 59). "Many a so-called successful city preacher lifts his eyes unto the balconies whence cometh his strength. If they be well-filled, he feels that the kingdom is coming" (p. 116). Dr. Sockman tells these preachers that "perhaps the pulpit might regain the public respect if the minister who realizes that he has no message on a given Sunday were to rise and frankly announce, 'Maybe next week, but not today'" (p. 254).

The remedy which is prescribed for these and the many other ills of the Church by the liberal doctor will not effect the cure. The liberal doctor does not think enough of the Bible. He calls it indeed "the Book of books," but he refuses to accept it as "verbally inspired" and "infallible" (p. 61). It is not the ultimate source of the saving truth. Spiritual knowledge and strength must come from man's experience. "Convincing religious authority is an authority that uses personal experience, or the process of rediscovering the truth about God in ourselves, as its organ and instrument" (p. 39). Does he believe in the deity of Jesus? "Jesus

made men aware of God. He had so completely surrendered himself to God that he felt the divine spirit had been surrendered to him" (p. 67). That is not a confession of the deity of Christ. In fact, Dr. Sockman goes so far as to write: "Yet, authoritative as the centuries have found Jesus to be, what are nineteen hundred years in the life of the race? Can we say that the Christ of Nazareth has given us the final wisdom? May not the future outgrow him?" (p. 70). — The Church is undernourished. Dr. Sockman sees that. "In many a parish earnest ministers flay their people with social and moral challenges, but do not feed their minds with sufficient spiritual food to sustain their *morale*" (p. 59). But he has no use for the old-fashioned Gospel. He puts it this way: "There is danger that in the current revolt against the tyranny of the physical sciences and the vogue of Liberalism religion may revert to obscure orthodoxy" (p. 37). The only remedy he knows of is the application of the Law. The specific is more practise of the social virtues. "Listen to Kagawa: 'Probably one reason why our Western friends do not understand redemption at the present moment is because of this lack of a full sense of human solidarity'" (p. 97).

Dr. Sockman is pastor of Christ Church (Methodist), New York, and Sunday morning preacher of the National Broadcasting Company.

TH. ENGELDER

The Clash. By Paul H. Andreen. MCMXXXVIII. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minn. 152 pages, 5¼×8. Price, \$1.00. Order through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

Just as soon as one reads the first chapter of this book, one will be bound to acknowledge that the author knows his subject and treats it with a warm sympathy. "The Clash" of which he speaks is that of the Church with various forces of our day and age, represented in the society in the midst of which the Church is trying to uphold the banner of the truth, of the salvation wrought by the atoning blood of Jesus Christ. The trend of the whole book is given in the sentence: "No one acquainted with the facts of the history of Christianity will fail to admit the intensity of the battle when Christ's teachings clash with the selfishness of man on all sectors — educational, economic, social, and spiritual." (P. 4.) The subject is treated in six chapters: A World in Conflict; The Church and the Social Order; The Church and World Peace; The Church To-day; The Present Crisis; The Church's Contribution to the Social Order. The paragraphs on birth control and on atheistic communism are alone worth the price of the book. It should be read by every pastor who wishes to be informed on present trends in the relation between the Church and the social order. P. E. KRETZMANN

The Rise and Growth of English Hymnody. By Harvey B. Marks, M. A. Introduction by H. Augustine Smith. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York. 288 pages, 8¼×5¼. Price, \$2.50. May be ordered through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

In recent years various writers in our country have essayed to make up for a long neglect of one of the important branches of English litera-

ture, English hymnody, following more or less in the footsteps of Dr. Louis F. Benson, who deserves the title of trail-blazer in this field. The book which the Rev. Harvey B. Marks here offers, presents the Anglican view-point. He sets high standards, and his judgments are sound. The difficult question "What is a hymn?" is carefully discussed in a satisfactory manner. We thoroughly agree with the author when he says: "It is much easier to say what is not a hymn than what is a hymn." That has been our own experience before classes at the Seminary. It is refreshing to read the author's verdict concerning "Beautiful Isle of Somewhere": "It is not much better than a song one might write and call 'Beautiful Isle of Nowhere.' It is a great pity that such a poor excuse for a hymn should become so popular with the unthinking multitude, because of its pleasing and sentimental type of music. It has been condemned alike by Roman Catholics, Episcopalians, and Protestant ministers as an unfitting song for the impressive office of the burial of the dead." On the other hand, it is disappointing to note that the author refers to Newman's "Lead, Kindly Light" as a hymn. It is inconsistent with his own standards. Newman himself did not consider it a hymn. Nor does it deserve that name for the reason that "it expresses the feelings or desire of many hearts," as that can hardly mean more than that such hearts are as unsettled in their religious convictions as Newman was when he wrote the words.

The material offered in this volume is divided into three parts. In the first, after devoting several chapters to the study of hymnody, different aspects of it, to the definition of a hymn, and the evaluation of hymns, the author gives a fair summary of ancient and medieval and German hymnody. In the second, he presents English hymnody from the early psalmody to the hymn in America. In the last part, he enters the present century and discusses the work of the leading hymnists. The closing chapters are on carols (including spirituals) and the musical setting of the hymns. Subject, authors', and first-line indices are in the rear. Each chapter concludes with a list of books for additional study. We recommend this book.

W. G. POLACK

God-Controlled Lives. By Sverre Norborg, Ph. D. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minn. 150 pages, 5½×8. Price, \$1.00.

Dr. Norborg is professor of philosophy at the University of Minnesota and lecturer in theology at Augsburg Theological Seminary. A prolific, though still young (and theologically still immature), writer, he is known (as the blurb says) by sixteen volumes, of which the most recent are *What Is Christianity?* and *Varieties of Christian Experience*. In *God-controlled Lives* he delineates the characters, sensibilities, and experiences of such persons as Simon Peter, Matthew, Jairus, Nicodemus, and other sinners of the New Testament, showing how Christ's coming into their lives resulted in sweet fruits of faith and Christian piety. He follows in a general way the simple method of expounding the texts which present the Biblical characters, adding, as he goes along, such lessons as the cases suggest. The "lives" are conceived as biographical

sermons, illustrating weighty practical truths which must still be observed by the modern follower of Jesus. It may be doubted whether the ordinary Christian will derive much benefit from reading the book; for the writer philosophizes more than he theologizes, and his paragraphs are directed to readers of college or at least high-school standing rather than to the common Christian folk. One great defect is lack of clarity as to the way of salvation.

J. THEODORE MUELLER

The Light in the Window. Funeral Sermons and Outlines by R. E. Golladay, A. M., D. D. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 119 pages, 5¼×7¾. Price, \$1.00. May be ordered through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

Dr. Golladay of Columbus, O., is the well-known author of sermons on the pericopal texts and on the Catechism. In this little volume he submits twenty-two outlines for funeral addresses. The ideal he has striven for is the preaching of "Scriptural funeral sermons; taking a text and adhering to it; using only such biographical and incidental matter as may be illustrative, comforting, or otherwise useful." He has also striven in his large ministry (he has buried nearly seven hundred persons in one congregation) "not to preach on the same text in the same circle of relatives or friends within the space of several years." He adds this interesting remark: "More than once, after a service was begun, I changed my text and sermon because I saw in the audience those who had been present at a recent burial service. I was able to do this because I generally have the substance of several such texts, with an outline, pretty well in mind at all times." These printed outlines will prove of value in a busy ministry and in some difficult cases.

THEODORE GRAEBNER

The Lord's Prayer and Christian Life. By Prof. Martin Graebner. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 74 pages, 5¼×7¾. Price, 75 cts.

We are happy to be able to announce the appearance of this book. While its size is such that one can well understand why the author says on the page preceding the introduction: "This little book is not an exhaustive treatise on the Lord's Prayer, but represents a modest endeavor to set forth its chief implications for our sanctification," it is so stimulating that one is glad to read it and to ponder its contents. In dwelling on the various words and petitions of the Lord's Prayer, the writer correctly gives much attention to Luther's classic interpretation in the Small Catechism. After having stated and analyzed the thought as contained in the words of the Lord's Prayer and in Luther's exposition, Bible-texts are quoted in which the Scriptural evidence is presented. This, however, is not done in a mechanical manner, but discussion and proof are so interwoven that the argumentation gets to be live and interesting. Besides, the author does not forget the bearing which the contents of the Lord's Prayer has on our Christian life. In this manner the little volume becomes truly edifying to those who read it with care and in a devout spirit. May it find many readers!

W. ARNDT

How Can the Lutheran Churches Effectively Serve with Word and Sacrament the Great Plains Area of Today and Tomorrow? By Dr. T. F. Gullixson. The Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O. 27 pages, 6×9. Price, 15 cts.

We recommend this pamphlet to all our District Presidents, mission boards, and to the pastors in the stricken areas for careful study. The author offers a wealth of information and many practical suggestions toward a solution of the problems involved.

TH. LAETSCH

Does God Want You to Be a Lodge-Member? Tract No. 127. Concordia Publishing House. 19 pages, 3½×5½. Price: 5 cts.; dozen, 36 cts., and postage; 100, \$2.50, and postage.

These two tracts deserve to be widely read in our circles. Our members ought to be well informed on the lodge question, and Holy Communion ought to be held in much higher regard than statistics on attendance indicate. We recommend these tracts for mass distribution.

TH. LAETSCH

Goforth of China. By Rosalind Goforth. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 364 pages, 8¼×5½. Price, \$2.00.

A biography of the prominent Presbyterian missionary, who labored in the various parts of China from 1888 to 1936, written by his wife.

W. G. POLACK

What Should Admonish and Incite a Christian to Receive the Sacrament Frequently? By E. W. Koehler. Tract No. 128. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 32 pages, 4×6. Price: 8 cts.; dozen, 72 cts., and postage; 100, \$5.00, and postage.

The Multiplication of Usable Personalities. By C. F. Yaeger. Board of American Missions of the United Lutheran Church. 64 pages, 4¾×7.

This is a handbook on personal evangelism, personal soul-winning. While we have question-marked a number of statements, we recommend the booklet to our pastors for study and practical application.

TH. LAETSCH

Proceedings of the Sixty-First Convention of the Central District of the Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 99 pages, 6×9. Price, 28 cts.—

Nineteenth Convention of the Southern Illinois District. 71 pages. Price, 14 cts.

In the report of the Central District, Pastor Carl A. Eberhard discusses in an interesting manner the ever timely doctrine, of special importance in our day, of the inspiration of Holy Scripture. He brings out clearly the Scriptural doctrine, answers a number of objections current in our day, and shows the importance of this doctrine for our faith and life. The report of the Southern Illinois District offers a paper by President J. W. Behnken, D. D., on "Leadership in the Church," and a paper in the German language on the doctrine of justification by Prof. W. Albrecht. Both papers deserve attentive reading, prayerful study, and grateful practical application of the divine truths to our private and congregational life.

TH. LAETSCH

Legal Aspects of Christian Science. By I. H. Rubenstein. Crandon Press, Chicago. 33 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$.

The author, a member of the Chicago bar, cites several court proceedings in which "the legal rights and remedies of Christian Scientists have been questioned and even denied." Since the pastor will attack Christian Science from an entirely different angle, this brief treatise has little value for him.

F. E. MAYER

BOOKS RECEIVED

From the Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich.:

Prophecy and the Tottering Nations. By Keith L. Brooks. 100 pages, $5 \times 7\frac{1}{2}$. Price, \$1.00.

Smoking and Other Habits. By Frank L. Wood, M. D. Price, paper, 25 cts.

From the Bible Institute Colportage Association, 843-845 North Wells Street, Chicago:

The Acts of the Apostles. With outlines, subdivisions, emphasized portions, and annotations, prepared by Norman H. Camp. 128 pages, $3 \times 4\frac{3}{4}$.

From the Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minn.:

My Lord the Shepherd Is a Westerner. By T. F. Gullixson, D. D., President Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minn. 36 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$. Price, 25 cts.

From the American Tract Society, 7 West 45th St., New York:

A Christian Layman's Handbook. By R. M. Kurtz, M. A. 72 pages, $4\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$. Price, 50 cts.

From the Christian Action, Cincinnati, O.:

Studies in Christian Living. By James De Forest Murch. 112 pages, $3\frac{1}{2} \times 6$. Price, 35 cts.

NOTICE TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS

In order to render satisfactory service, we must have our current mailing-list correct. The expense of maintaining this list has been materially increased. Under present regulations we are subject to a "fine" on all parcels mailed to an incorrect address, inasmuch as we must pay 2 cents for every notification sent by the postmaster on a parcel or periodical which is undeliverable because no forwarding address is available or because there has been a change of address. This may seem insignificant, but in view of the fact that we have subscribers getting three or more of our periodicals and considering our large aggregate subscription list, it may readily be seen that it amounts to quite a sum during a year; for the postmaster will address a notification to each individual periodical. Our subscribers can help us by notifying us—one notification (postal card, costing only 1 cent) will take care of the addresses for several publications. We shall be very grateful for your cooperation.

Kindly consult the address label on this paper to ascertain whether your subscription has expired or will soon expire. "May 38" on the label means that your subscription has expired. Please pay your agent or the Publisher promptly in order to avoid interruption of service. It takes about two weeks before the address label can show change of address or acknowledgment of remittance.

When paying your subscription, please mention name of publication desired and exact name and address (both old and new, if change of address is requested).

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.